

581-96
F776


THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.



Dean Hoffman Fund

THE
ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH



THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY WISDOM AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

BY
ADRIAN FORTESCUE, PH.D., D.D.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY THE AUTHOR

LONDON
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

1907

2/19A
F371
44539

πάτραν δ' ἔναιον ἥ μὲν ἑλλάδα
κλήρῳ λαχοῦσα γαῖαν, ἥ δὲ βάρβαρον.
τούτῳ στάσιν τιν', ὥς ἐγὼ δόκουν ὀρᾶν,
τεύχειν ἐν ἀλλήλαισιν.

PERSÆ, 186-189.

ΥΠΕΡΒΟΛΕΣ ΔΕΙΤΕ ΔΕΙΣ
ΥΠΕΡΒΟΛΕΣ
ΥΠΕΡΒΟΛΕΣ

PREFACE

THIS little book is intended to supply not so much matter for controversy as a certain amount of information about the Orthodox Church. People in the West have too long forgotten that enormous mass of their fellow Christians who live on the other side of the Adriatic Sea and the river Vistula, and now that Anglicans especially have begun to take an interest in what they look upon as another branch of the Church, it seems regrettable that English Catholics as a rule have only the vaguest and the most inaccurate ideas about the people whom they confuse under the absurd name of "Greeks." During the late war one saw how widespread were such ideas as that the Russian clergy were under the Patriarch of Constantinople and said Mass in Greek. It is chiefly with the hope of rectifying such mistakes that the book has been written. There is nothing in it that has not been said often and better before, and the only excuse for its publication is that there does not seem to be yet anything of the kind from the Catholic point of view in English. As it is written for Catholics I have generally supposed that point of view and have not filled up the pages by repeating once more arguments for the Primacy, Infallibility of the Pope and so on, such as can be easily found already in the publications of the Catholic Truth Society.

The complete titles of the works quoted will be found in the List of Books. M.P.L. and M.P.G. stand for Migne : *Patrologia latina* and *græca* respectively.

Two points need a word of explanation. The first is the spelling of Greek names. There is really no reason for

writing Greek names down to about 1453 as if they were bad Latin and then suddenly transforming them into the semblance of worse Italian ; for making the same name, for instance, *Hypsilantius* if it occurs in the 9th century, and *Ipsilanti* when it comes again in the 19th. Undoubtedly the reasonable course would be to write them all out as they are, in our letters. But what is already a matter of course in Germany would seem intolerably pedantic in English. I began with some such idea. Then I found that it would lead to writing *Gregorios*, *Konstantinos*, even *Athenai* and *Antiocheia*. I have not the courage. So names that have an English (that is not Latin) form have been let alone—*Gregory*, *John*, *Philip*, *Paul* ; names whose Latin forms are known everywhere are written in Latin—*Athanasius*, *Heraclius*, *Photius*. Only in the case of less known names have I ventured to spell them in Greek rather than form any more sham Latin—*Anthimos*, *Nektarios*, *Kyriakos*. Sometimes the same name belongs to different people, and then it seems hopeless to try to be consistent. For instance, the present Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria calls himself *Photios*, and I have left him so, in spite of his more famous namesake. Unless one goes the whole length and says that Iustinianos lived at Konstantinupolis, I do not know what else can be done. The Greek *v* is *y* and *ov* becomes *u* in any case. Of course this spelling is no sort of guide to the pronunciation. All the Greek words at any rate in this book should be pronounced as Modern Greek. The few Slav names that occur are not written according to any system at all, but are merely copied from various books in other languages that evidently follow different systems of transliteration.

The other point is the use of the word *Orthodox*. Since the schism I have called the people in union with the Œcumenical Patriarch so. Of course the name then has a special and technical meaning. Orthodox in its real sense is just what we believe them not to be. But, in the first place, it seems impossible to find any other name. *Eastern* is too wide, the Copts and Armenians form Eastern Churches, *Schismatic* involves the same difficulty, besides being needlessly offensive. We do

not in ordinary conversation speak of Protestants as heretics. The name commonly used, *Greek*, is the worst of all. The only body that ever calls itself, or can with any sort of reason be called the Greek Church, is the Established Church of the kingdom of Greece ; and that is only one, and a very small one, of the sixteen bodies that make up this great Communion. To call the millions of Russians, who say their prayers in Old Slavonic and obey the Holy Synod at Petersburg, Greeks is as absurd as calling us all Italians. There is no parallel with our name *Roman*. We use the Roman liturgy in the Roman language and obey the Roman Patriarch. They use the Byzantine liturgy in all sorts of languages, and the enormous majority obey no Patriarch at all. *Byzantine Orthodox* would more or less correspond to Roman Catholic, but the Byzantine Patriarch has no jurisdiction outside his reduced Patriarchate and occupies a very different position from that of the Roman Pope. And then courteous and reasonable people generally call any religious body by the name it calls itself. We have no difficulty in speaking of Evangelicals in Germany, the Church of England at home, and the Salvation Army everywhere. Of course one conceives these names as written in inverted commas, like those of the Holy Roman and the Celestial Empires. In the same way most people call us Catholics. Naturally all Christians believe that they are members of the Universal Church of Christ, and most of them profess their faith in it when they say the Creed. The way in which High Church Anglicans have suddenly realized this and have discovered that they would give away their own case by calling us Catholics is astonishingly naïve. Of course they think that they are really Catholics too ; so do all Christians. And we never imagined that we are called so except as a technical name which happens to have become ours, and which even Turks (whom, by the way, it is polite to call *True Believers*) give only to us. The body about which this book treats always calls itself the *Orthodox Eastern Church*, and in the East we call them Orthodox and they call us Catholics (unless when they mean to be rude), and no one thinks for a moment that either uses these names except as technical terms.

This book was intended at first to contain accounts of the other Eastern Churches too. Want of space made that impossible. It is proposed to make another volume some day describing the Nestorians, Armenians, Jacobites, Copts, Abyssinians, and, above all, our shamefully neglected brothers the Uniates. I fear that, in the last part especially, the account of the Orthodox would not please them. I am sorry that the racial quarrels among them loom so large ; but it is true that these fill up nearly all their history during the last century. I have tried to write it all fairly, and have said what I think should be said in their excuse. In spite of this, in spite of the irony which is not mine but that of the circumstances, this little book has been written without any sort of rancour against and, I hope, without any want of due respect towards those great sees whose wonderful history and ancient traditions make them the most venerable part of the Christian world—except only that greater Western throne whose communion they have rejected.

JERUSALEM, *Low Sunday* (Kal. Greg.),
Holy Cross Sunday (Kal. Iul.), 1907.

CONTENTS

LIST OF BOOKS	PAGE XV
-------------------------	------------

PART I

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH BEFORE THE SCHISM

CHAPTER I

THE GREAT PATRIARCHATES	5
1. Rome. 2. Alexandria. 3. Antioch. 4. Jerusalem. 5. Constantinople. 6. Cyprus. Summary.	

CHAPTER II

ROME AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES	51
1. The Eastern Fathers and the Papacy. 2. Appeals to Rome from the East. 3. The Popes and the General Councils. 4. Ill-feeling towards Rome in the East. Summary.	

CHAPTER III

THE FAITH AND RITES OF THE BYZANTINE CHURCH BEFORE THE SCHISM	98
1. The Faith of the Byzantine Church. 2. Eastern Liturgies. 3. The Syrian Rite. 4. The Egyptian Rite. 5. The Byzantine Rite. 6. Byzantine Piety and Morals. 7. Byzantine Art. Summary.	

CONTENTS

PART II
THE SCHISM

CHAPTER IV

PAGE

THE SCHISM OF PHOTIUS 135

1. The Patriarch Ignatius. 2. Photius. 3. Open Schism.
4. The Question of Bulgaria. 5. The Filioque. 6. The Eighth General Council. 7. Photius lawful Patriarch.
8. The End of Photius. 9. Reunion after Photius. Summary.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHISM OF CERULARIUS 172

1. The Pope, the Emperor, and the Patriarch. 2. The Schism. 3. After the Schism. 4. The End of Cerularius. Summary.

PART III
THE ORTHODOX CHURCH SINCE THE SCHISM

CHAPTER VI

THE REUNION COUNCILS 201

1. The Council of Bari, 1098. 2. The Second Council of Lyons, 1274. 3. The Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438-1439. 4. Cardinal Bessarion. Summary.

CHAPTER VII

THE CRUSADES AND THE BYZANTINE CHURCH 221

1. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. 2. The Crusaders and the Empire. 3. The Fourth Crusade, 1204. Summary.

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER VIII

	PAGE
UNDER THE TURK	229

1. The Fall of Constantinople, May 29, 1453. 2. The Rayahs. 3. The Porte and the Christian Churches. 4. The Porte and the Œcumenical Patriarch. Summary.

CHAPTER IX

ORTHODOX THEOLOGY	245
-----------------------------	-----

1. Theologians since 1453. 2. The Orthodox and the Lutherans. 3. The Orthodox and the Anglicans. 4. Cyril Lukaris and the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672. Summary.

PART IV

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AT THE PRESENT DAY.

CHAPTER X

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH	273
---	-----

1. The Political Situation and the Great Church. 2. The Patriarchate of Alexandria. 3. The Patriarchate of Antioch. 4. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem. 5. The Church of Cyprus. 6. The Church of Russia (1589). 6a. The Church of Georgia. 7. The Church of Carlovitz (1765). 8. The Church of Czernagora (1765). 9. The Church of Sinai (1782). 10. The Greek Church (1850). 11. The Church of Hermannstadt (1864). 12. The Bulgarian Exarchate (1870). 13. The Church of Czernovitz (1873). 14. The Church of Servia (1879). 15. The Roumanian Church (1885). 16. The Church of Hercegovina and Bosnia (1880). Summary.

CHAPTER XI

THE ORTHODOX HIERARCHY	338
----------------------------------	-----

1. The Œcumenical Patriarch and his Court. 2. The other Patriarchs, Bishops, Priests, and Clerks. 3. The Monks. Summary.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XII

	PAGE
THE ORTHODOX FAITH	361
1. Orthodox Symbolic Books. 2. The Church and the Primacy. 3. The Filioque. 4. Transubstantiation. 5. The Epiklesis. 6. Purgatory. 7. The Immaculate Conception. 8. Modern Orthodox Theology. Summary.	

CHAPTER XIII

ORTHODOX RITES	395
1. The Calendar. 2. The Orthodox Service Books. 3. The Churches, Vestments, and Sacred Vessels. 4. Church Music. 5. The Holy Liturgy. 6. Other Rites ; the Sacraments. Summary.	

CHAPTER XIV

THE QUESTION OF REUNION	429
INDEX	441

ILLUSTRATIONS

THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY WISDOM AT CONSTANTINOPLE	<i>Frontispiece</i>
MAP OF THE FIVE PATRIARCHATES IN THE FIFTH CENTURY	<i>To face p. 49</i>
PLAN OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY WISDOM	<i>Page 126</i>
GROTTAFERRATA	<i>To face p. 169</i>
VESTMENTS OF THE BYZANTINE RITE	,, 405
INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE BYZANTINE LITURGY.	,, 409

LIST OF BOOKS

ANY sort of complete bibliography of the questions touched upon in this book would be a very large undertaking. The following list contains most of the works that have been used or consulted for the various chapters. In any case I have quoted only one or two books on each subject, leaving out those that seem either out of date or less useful. The list may easily be expanded into a very large one, since the German books nearly all contain further bibliographies.

CHAPTER I

THE GREAT PATRIARCHATES

The history of this development will be found in outline in any Church History. I have referred to J. Hergenröther : *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (iv edition, ed. by J. P. Kirsch, Freiburg, Herder, 1902. Vols. i and ii) ; F. X. Kraus : *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Trier, Lintz, iv ed. 1896), and L. Duchesne : *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1906), i. The first chapter of L. Duchesne : *Origines du Culte chrétien* (Paris, Fontemoing, ii ed. 1898) covers the same ground. Michael le Quien : *Oriens christianus in IV patriarchatus digestus* (Paris, 1740) is the standard work for the history of the Eastern Patriarchates. Le Quien was a learned Dominican. In the three folio volumes of his work he traces the history of each province and diocese, and gives biographical notices of all the bishops known. The maps are also valuable. Now that enormously more is known about the Christian East the time has come for a new *Oriens christianus*.

The Augustinians of the Assumption at Constantinople are projecting such a work. Meanwhile Le Quien is still the first source to consult for the history of any Eastern see. F. C. Burkitt : *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, Murray, 1904).

CHAPTER II

ROME AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES

Collections of texts from the Fathers about the Roman Primacy form an indispensable part of every dogmatic treatise *de Romano pontifice*. From these the Greek Fathers may easily be picked out. H. Hurter, S.J. : *Theologia dogmatica compendium* (ix ed. Innsbruck, 1896), vol. i, tract iii, p. 2, pp. 339-461; W. Wilmers, S.J. : *De Christi Ecclesia* (Regensburg, Pustet, 1897), lib. ii, pp. 148-280; C. Pesch, S.J. : *Prælectiones dogmaticæ* (Freiburg, Herder, ii ed. 1898), vol. i, p. ii, sect. iv, art. ii, 277-315, contain long chains of such texts. The acts of councils will, of course, be found in Hardouin and Mansi; the classical history of them is Hefele : *Conciliengeschichte* (Freiburg, Herder, 8 vols, 2nd ed. 1873, seq.). F. Lauchert : *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien nebst den apostolischen Kanones* (Freiburg, Mohr, 1896) is a useful little book (the texts are in the original languages); H. Denzinger : *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum* (xth ed. just published by Herder at Freiburg, 1906) is the collection which every one is supposed to have (there is great need of a rather more complete collection of the same kind). The case against the Primacy in the first centuries has been put best in F. Maassen : *Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom* (Bonn, 1853), and Puller : *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome* (London, Longmans). Of the numberless works on our side, those of L. Rivington, especially *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter* (Longmans), are perhaps the best known in England. Two essays by F. X. Funk : *Die Berufung der ökumenischen Synoden des Altertums* and *Die päpstliche Bestätigung der acht ersten allgemeinen Synoden* (in his *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen u. Untersuchungen*, P. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1897, vol. i) have been used in this chapter.

CHAPTER III

FAITH AND LITURGIES BEFORE THE SCHISM

Each article of Faith will be found discussed in its place in dogmatic text-books. Leo Allatius: *De Ecclesiæ occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione libri tres* (Köln, 1648, 4to) is an apology of the Catholic view. Allatius (1586-1669) was a Uniate, student, then professor at the Greek College at Rome, and finally Vatican librarian. The standard book for the texts of liturgies is F. Brightman: *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. i. *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, Clar. Press, 1896). See also L. Duchesne: *Origines du culte chrétien* (op. cit.) and F. Probst: *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen, 1870), and *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster, 1893). E. Renaudot: *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio* (ed. ii, Frankfurt, 1847, 2 vols.) was the classical work till it was supplanted by Brightman. Prince Max of Saxony has published the lectures on Eastern rites that he held lately at Freiburg (Switzerland), in Latin (no place nor date). For other works on liturgy see chap. xiii below. J. Pargoire: *L'Église Byzantine de 527 à 847* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1905) discusses all the questions of rites, morals, art, history, theology, &c., during that period. For general Byzantine History see—

Oman: *The Byzantine Empire* (London, 1892).

Hertzberg: *Gesch. der Byzantiner* (Berlin, 1883).

Bury: *History of the later Roman Empire, 395-800* (London, 1889. 2 vols.).

Roth: *Gesch. des Byzantinischen Reiches* (Leipzig, 1904) is a useful compendium, and all M. Ch. Diehl's work (*Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI Siècle*, Paris, 1901; *Théodora*, Paris, 1904; *Figures byzantines*, Paris, 1906, &c.) is admirable.

K. Krumbacher: *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1897) contains notices of the lives and works of all Byzantine writers from Justinian I to the Turkish conquest (527-1453).

Marin: *Les moines de Constantinople, 330-898* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1897).

For Byzantine Art—

C. Bayet : *L'Art byzantin* (iii ed. Paris, Picard, 1904).

C. Diehl : *Études byzantines* (Paris, Picard, 1905).

Strzygowski : *Orient oder Rom* (Leipzig, 1901).

— *Byzantinische Denkmäler* (3 vols. Vienna, 1891–1903).

F. X. Kraus : *Gesch. der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg, Herder, vol. i, 1896).

S. Beissel, S.J. : *Altchristliche Kunst u. Liturgie in Italien* (Herder, 1899).

Lethaby and Swainson : *The Church of Sancta Sophia* (London, Macmillan, 1894).

Diehl : *Études byzantines* (*op. cit.*), 2 and 3, gives a bibliography of the enormous number of works on the Byzantine question published during the last few years.

CHAPTERS IV AND V

THE SCHISM OF PHOTIUS

J. Hergenröther : *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel* (Regensburg, Manz, 1867) is, without question, the most exhaustive work. The three large volumes contain not only a detailed account of Photius's life and writings, but elaborate discussions of the remote causes of the schism, the schism of Cerularius and its effects, so that they cover nearly all the ground touched on by this book. A supplement gives a collection of inedited works of Photius. Kattenbusch describes it in the German Protestant *Realenzyklopädie* as being "without doubt the most learned work" (xv, 375, iii ed.), and in his *Konfessionskunde* (i, 119), "admirable for its learning and desire to be just." All the documents relating to Cerularius's schism are edited by C. Will : *Acta et scripta quæ de controversiis ecclesiæ græcæ et latinæ sæculo XI composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861). Psellos's History has been edited by C. Sathas in Methuen's *Byzantine Texts* (1899). See also L. Bréhier : *Le Schisme oriental du XI siècle* (Paris, Leroux, 1899). A. Pichler : *Gesch. der kirchl. Trennung zwischen dem Orient u. Occident* (Munich, 1864–5. 2 vols.). Norden : *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*. (Berlin, 1903).

An interesting picture of the Orthodox point of view is A. Demetrakopoulos : 'Ιστορία τοῦ σχίσματος τῆς λατινικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου ἐλληνικῆς (Leipzig, 1867). The title sufficiently indicates its tendency. The author discusses the history from this point of view, beginning with St. Photius and ending with the pseudo-synod at Florence. A. Pellegrini : 'Η ἐλληνικὴ μονὴ τῆς κρυπτοφέρης (Syra, Freris, 1904).

CHAPTER VI

REUNION COUNCILS

Ragey : *Histoire de S. Anselme* (Paris, 1889), ii, chap. 34 for Bari ; Kirsch-Hergenröther and Hefele (*op. cit.*) for all three councils. Pastor : *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg : Herder, 1901), i, 303, *seq.* Creighton : *History of the Papacy* (Longmans, 1899), ii, chap. 8, for Florence. For Bessarion, Vast : *Le Cardinal Bessarion* (Paris, 1878) ; Rocholl : *Bessarion, eine Studie zur Geschichte der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1904). There is also a life of him by A. Sadov in Russian (Petersburg, 1883). There ought to be one in English.

CHAPTER VII

THE CRUSADES

Bongars : *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hannover, 1611) is the old standard work. Röhricht : *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge im Umriss* (Innsbruck, 1898) is a very useful summary. See also C. R. Conder : *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, Pal. Expl. Fund, 1897). B. Kugler : *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (ii ed., Berlin, 1891). Michaud : *Histoire des Croisades*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1819). Migne : *Dictionnaire des Croisades* (Paris, 1852). H. Prutz : *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883). G. Schlumberger : *Les Principautés Franques du Levant* (Paris, 1877). *La Croisade de Constantinople* (Bibliothèque des chefs-d'œuvre, Paris, Berche et Tralin, 1880).

CHAPTER VIII

UNDER THE TURK

E. Pears : *The Destruction of the Greek Empire* (Longmans, 1903).

For this chapter and for all the following ones I have chiefly used A. Diomede Kyriakos : Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία (Athens, Anestes Konstantinides, 1898. 3 vols.), vol. iii. M. Kyriakos is a typical example of the Greek who has studied in Germany. He heard Hase at Jena, and is now Professor of Church History at the University of Athens. His book is an adaptation of German methods in Greek: it is interesting throughout, especially in the third volume, which contains the history of his Church since 1453. For Turkish law see H. Grimme : *Mohammed, II System der koranischen Theologie* (Münster, 1895), E. von Mülinen : *Die lateinische Kirche im Türkischen Reich* (Berlin, ed. 2, 1903—an exceedingly valuable little book that contains much more than its title promises). For the general history, Hammer : *Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches* (ed. ii in 4 vols. 1834-1836), and De la Jonquière : *Hist. de l'Empire ottoman* (ed. ii. Paris, Hachette, 1897).

CHAPTER IX

ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

Besides Kyriakos (*op. cit.*), Ph. Meyer : *Die theologische Literatur der griechischen Kirche im XVI Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1899). *Acta et scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiæ* (Wittenberg, 1584).

P. Renaudin : *Luthériens et Grecs-Orthodoxes* (Paris, Bloud, 1903).

G. Williams : *The Orthodox and the Non-jurors* (Rivingtons, 1868).

Birkbeck : *Russia and the English Church during the last Fifty Years* (London, 1895). This is one of the books published by the Eastern Church Association.

- J. Wordsworth : *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates* (Oxford, Parker, 1902). He thinks Lukaris was murdered by the Jesuits !
- A. Bulgakoff : *The Question of Anglican Orders* (translated by W. J. Birkbeck, London, S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society, 1899).
- G. B. Howard : *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches* (London, Longmans, 1892).
- A. Pichler : *Der Patriarch Cyril Lukaris und seine Zeit* (Munich, 1862).

CHAPTER X

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

I name here several books that treat of the Orthodox Church in general.

J. Mason Neale : *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (London, 1850) is incomplete. It contains a general introduction and history of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem only. There is no account of the schism. Dr. Neale's work was useful inasmuch as it, almost for the first time, made the Eastern Churches known to English people. But it is in no way scientific. His object is always edification and the promotion of union with these Churches rather than critical accuracy. He is absurdly flattering to every one who was "Orthodox," absurdly unjust to Copts, Jacobites, &c. He seems to conceive the supremacy of Constantinople all over the East as the primitive ideal. In any case this book must now be considered as having been superseded.

A. P. Stanley : *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (London, 1861) is still sometimes quoted. It was never of any value.

F. Kattenbusch : *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Konfessionskunde* (Freiburg, Mohr, i, *Die orthodoxe anatolische Kirche*, 1892). This is by far the most important work of all now on the subject. The history, development, politics, divisions, dogma, hierarchy, rites and devotions of the Orthodox Church are discussed at length with every detail that could be desired, and with

accurate references. There are also superb bibliographies. The author is a Lutheran who has no interest in any side, but is always scrupulously exact and impartial. It is the book that should be studied by every one who wishes to know more about the subject.

H. J. Schmitt : *Kritische geschichte der neugriechischen u. der russischen Kirche* (Mainz, 1854). In spite of its title this is not a critical history, but a book of controversy chiefly directed against the Holy Synods that now govern many Orthodox Churches.

I. Silbernagl : *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Regensburg, Manz, ii ed., 1904). An accurate and very valuable account of the constitution, hierarchy, numbers, revenues and political rights of all Eastern Churches.

Études préparatoires au pèlerinage eucharistique en Terre sainte (Paris, Bonne Presse, 1893).

A. L. Hickmann : *Karte der Verbreitungsgebiete der Religionen in Europa* (Vienna, Freytag). All the sees of both Catholics and Orthodox are marked ; there are comparative tables of numbers of members. Kyriakos (*op. cit.*) is also valuable for this chapter. F. Tournèbize, S.J. : *L'Église grecque-orthodoxe* (Paris, Bloud, 1901, 2 vols.).

A. d'Avril : *Documents relatifs aux Églises de l'Orient* (iii ed., Paris, 1885).

L. Duchesne : *Eglises séparées* (Paris, Fontemoing, ii ed., 1905). I have constantly used the *Echos d'Orient*, a review published six times a year since Oct., 1897, by the Augustinians of the Assumption at Constantinople (and at Paris, rue Bayard, 5). It contains admirable dissertations on all manner of questions connected with the Christian East, and always gives the latest news from the Orthodox Church (see Gelzer's appreciation in *Geistliches u. Weltliches*, p. 142 : "exceedingly well written, extraordinarily full of news, and excellently well informed"). It is to be regretted that its tone is bitter against the Orthodox and sometimes undignified.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien (Paris, Picard, quarterly). *Oriens Christianus* (Rome, Propaganda Press, twice a year). *Bessarione* (Rome, ed. by Mgr. N. Marini, six times a year). The *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (ed. by Krumbacher, Leipzig, Teubner,

quarterly) has very complete and valuable bibliographies. In the *Revue bénédictine* (Maredsous) P. de Meester is writing a series of articles on Orthodox theology.

Of Greek papers I have used the Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ ἀλήθεια, the official organ of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and the Νέα ἡμέρα of Trieste, which is certainly the best Orthodox paper, also the Ἄστυ of Athens, which is respectable, and the Νέον ἄστυ, which is not. They are chiefly interesting because of their violent attacks on the Bulgars.

Pisani : *À travers l'Orient* (Paris, Bloud) ; pp. xi seq. contain a bibliography.

For the political situation in the Balkans see H. Brailsford : *Macedonia* (Methuen, 1906). Mr. Brailsford was a member of the Macedonian Relief Committee during the winter of 1903-4. His book is admirably temperate in tone, and he writes of the things he himself saw. Only in questions of theology is he not at home. His remark about the Bulgarian Uniates (p. 73) and his advice to Protestant missionaries to get ordained in the Orthodox Church to make their work easier (p. 74) are amusing. But his indictment against the Patriarchist party in Macedonia is absolutely crushing.

H. Gelzer : *Geistliches u. Weltliches aus dem Türkisch-griechischen Orient*, and *Vom heiligen Berge und aus Makedonien* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1900 and 1904) are charming descriptions of the travels of an always sympathetic scholar. J. F. Fraser : *Pictures from the Balkans* (Cassell, 1906) has interesting pictures. D. Brancoff : *La Macédoine et sa population chrétienne* (Paris, Plon, 1905) gives tables of statistics and maps, which look very bad for the Greeks. C. Bojan : *Les Bulgares et le patriarche œcuménique, ou comment le patriarche traite les Bulgares* (Paris, Librairie gén. de droit, 1905) contains appalling accusations against the Phanar and its bishops. N. Milasch (Orth. Bp. of Zara) : *Das Kirchenrecht der Morgenländischen Kirche* (ii ed., Mostar, 1905).

For the rights and the court of the Œcumenical Patriarch see, besides Silbernagl, Kattenbusch, and Kyriakos (op. cit.), Γενικοί κανονισμοὶ περὶ διευθετήσεως τῶν ἐκκλ. κ. ἐθν. πραγμάτων τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν θρόνον διατελοῦντων ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν,

ὑπηκόων τῆς Α. Μεγαλειότητος τοῦ Σουλτάνου (Constantinople, Patriarchal Press, 1888). This work is a collection of all the laws affecting the Orthodox Church in Turkey.

M. Gedeon : Πατριαρχικοὶ πίνακες (Constantinople, 1890), a list of Patriarchs of Constantinople from St. Andrew (!), with biographical notices. Χρονικὰ τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ οἴκου κ. τοῦ ναοῦ (Const. 1884), a history of the vicissitudes of the Patriarch's palace and church.

Kyriakos gives a list of the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

For the other Churches—

C. D. Cobham : *An attempt at a Bibliography of Cyprus* (Nicosia, 1900), contains 728 titles. *Handbook of Cyprus*, 1905 (London, Stanford, pp. 99-103, "Christianity in Cyprus").

Kyprianos : Ἱστορία χρονολογικὴ τῆς νήσου Κύπρου (Venice, 1788, Nicosia, 1902).

Löcher : *Cybern* (Stuttgart, iii ed. 1880).

Hackett : *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* (London, Methuen).

Milas : *Gli apostoli slavi Cirillo e Metodio* (translated from the Servian, Triest, 1887).

Rambaud : *Histoire de la Russie* (Paris, Hachette, 1895).

Gondal : *L'Église russe* (Paris, Bloud, 1905).

W. Palmer : *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the years 1840, 1841* (London, Longmans, 1895).

Mouravieff : *History of the Church of Russia* (translated by Blackmore, London, 1842).

A. C. Headlam : *The Teaching of the Russian Church* (Rivingtons, for the Eastern Church Association, 1897).

G. Semeria : *La Chiesa greco-russa* (Genoa, 1904).

Palmieri : *Il ristabilimento del patriarcato in Russia* (Bessarione, x., pp. 42 seq.).

Oliver Wardrop : *The Kingdom of Georgia* (London, 1888).

N. Nilles : *Aus Iberien oder Georgien* (Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie, Innsbruck, 1903, 652-683).

A. Palmieri : *La conversione ufficiale degl' Iberi al cristianesimo* (Oriens Christ., 1902 and 1903).

De la Jonquière (*op. cit.*) tells the story of the independence of Balkan States in the 19th century.

- W. A. Phillips : *The War of Greek Independence* (London, Smith, Elder, 1897).
- Mendelssohn-Bartholdy : *Gesch. Griechenlands von der Eroberung Konstantinopels durch die Türken bis auf unsere Tage* (1870-4. I have only the Greek translation of this, Athens, 1885).
- Pharmakidis : 'Ο συνοδικὸς τόμος ἢ περὶ ἀληθείας (Athens, 1852).
- Jirecek : *Gesch. der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876).
- A. d'Avril : *La Bulgarie chrétienne* (Revue de l'Orient chrétien, Paris, 2nd year, 1897, Nos. 1-4). *Les Bulgares* (Paris, Leroux).
- S. Gopcevic : *Serbien und die Serben*, I (1888).

CHAPTER XI

THE ORTHODOX HIERARCHY

- Silbernagl, Kyriakos, Kattenbusch, Gedeon and the Γενικοὶ κανονισμοί (*op. cit.*).
- F. Gillmann : *Das Institut der Chorbischöfe im Orient* (Munich, Leutner, 1903).
- For the Monks :—
- Gelzer : *Vom h. Berge, u.s.w.* (*op. cit.*).
- A. Schmidtke : *Das klosterland des Athos* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1903).
- M. I. Gedeon : 'Ο "Αθως, ἀναμνήσεις, ἔγγραφα, σημειώσεις (Const. 1885).
- A. Riley : *Athos, or the Mountain of the Monks* (London, 1887).

CHAPTER XII

THE ORTHODOX FAITH

The symbolic writings are collected in E. J. Kimmel : *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiæ orientalis* (Jena, 1850. Greek and Latin) and J. Michalcescu : *Die Bekenntnisse u. die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der griech.-orient. Kirche* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1904. Greek only).

CHAPTER XIII

ORTHODOX RITES

By far the most erudite work is N. Nilles, S.J. : *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiæ, orientalis et occidentalis* (Innsbruck, Rauch, ii ed. 1896-7, 2 vols.). In the first volume he follows the Proprium Sanctorum, in the second the Proprium de Tempore. For each day he gives the Latin and the various Eastern feasts, and accumulates every sort of information that can conceivably be connected with them. There are long excursions on all kinds of irrelevant matters. There is also much valuable matter about the early history of the Eastern Churches, the Primacy in the first centuries, and every sort of theological question scattered everywhere about the two volumes.

The official editions of the Orthodox service books are printed at the sign of the Phoenix at Venice (various dates), the corresponding Uniate books at the Roman Propaganda Press.

J. Goar, O.P. : *Euchologion sive Rituale Græcorum* (ii ed., Venice, folio, 1720) is the text with very discursive notes and illustrations. This is still the standard work of reference for all Greek rites.

Besides Brightman and Renaudot (*op. cit.*) :—

J. M. Neale : *The Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil* (London, Hays, 1875, in Greek, also another volume : *The Translations of the Primitive Liturgies of S. Mark, &c.*).

J. N. W. B. Robertson : *The Divine Liturgies of our Fathers among the Saints, John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified* (London, Nutt, 1894), in Greek and English. It also contains the Hesperinos and various other prayers, but has no sort of table of contents nor index.

C. Charon : *Les saintes et divines Liturgies de nos Saints Pères, Jean Chrysostome, Basile le Grand et Grégoire le Grand* (in French, Beirut, Coury, 1904—the Uniate use).

R. Storf : *Die griechischen Liturgien der hlgen Jakobus, Markus, Basilius und Chrysostomus* (Kempten, Kösel, 1877, vol. 41 of Thalhofer's *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*), in German, with useful notes.

- Provost Alexios Maltzew, of the Russian Embassy Church at Berlin, has translated the Russian service books into German (*Euchologion*, Vienna, Zamarski, 1861, other books Berlin, Siegismund, 1892, *seq.*).
- L. Allatius : *De libris et rebus eccl. Græcorum* (Köln, 1646).
- L. Clugnet : *Dictionnaire grec-français des noms liturgiques en usage dans l'Église grecque* (Paris, Picard, 1895).
- (P. de Meester, O.S.B.) *Officio dell'inno acatisto* (Rome, 1903)—Greek and Italian.
- H. Gäisser, O.S.B. : *Le Système musical de l'Église grecque* (Maredsous, 1901).
- J. B. Rebours : *Traité de Psaltique. Théorie et Pratique du chant dans l'Église grecque* (Paris, Picard, 1906) is a practical manual—the only one as yet—of their chant.

CHAPTER XIV

THE QUESTION OF REUNION

- P. Michel : *L'Orient et Rome, Étude sur l'Union* (ii ed., Paris, Lecoffre, 1895).
- A. St. Chomjakow : *Quelques mots par un Chrétien orthodoxe sur les Communions occidentales* (Paris, 1855), *L'Église latine et l'Église protestante au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient* (Paris, 1872). See also the (Old Catholic) *Revue internationale de Théologie* (Berne), iv, 46, *seq.*
- P. de Meester, O.S.B. : *Λέων ὁ ιγ' καὶ ἡ ἀνατολικὴ ἐκκλησία* (Syra, 1905).
- M. M. : *Ἀπάντησις εἰς τὴν. . . ἐγκύκλιον τῆς ἐκκλ. κωνστ.* (Constantinople, 1895).
- Lastly, *List of Books on Eastern Christendom* (Oxford, Parker, 1902).

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

THE history of the Eastern Churches begins at the time of the Apostles. The native Christians of Jerusalem, Cyprus, Greece, the few communities still left in Antioch, or scattered through Asia Minor have not now much to boast of, in comparison with the far greater and more flourishing Churches of Western Europe ; but they remember with just pride that the Gospel was preached to their fathers, not by unknown missionaries of the fourth or fifth centuries, not even by saints sent out from the great Roman Church, but by the Apostles themselves, and they read the names of their cities and of their first bishops in the pages of the New Testament. And during the first six centuries at least, these Churches play a leading part in the general history of Christianity. It was in the East that the great heresies arose, their chief opponents were Eastern bishops, and it was in the East that the first eight general councils were held. To write a history of any of the Eastern Churches during these earlier centuries then, would be only to tell over again the most important facts of general Church history. We will therefore pass over the great public events that are commonly known, and be content with an account of the domestic affairs of the most important of these Churches, that of the great body of Christians who remained Orthodox after the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies, over whom the Patriarchs of Constantinople gradually managed to assume the

leadership, and who fell into schism with that see in the 9th and 11th centuries. This is the communion that calls itself the Orthodox Church.

Such an account will fall naturally into four parts, treating of : I. The period before the Great Schism, that is during the first eight centuries. II. The Story of the Schism. III. From the Schism to Modern Times. IV. The Orthodox Church at the Present Time.

PART I

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH BEFORE
THE SCHISM

IN this first part we may divide our account of the facts that most interest Catholics into three chapters : (1) Of the development of the order of the Hierarchy, and of the rise of the great Patriarchates. (2) Of their relations to the Latin Churches, and especially of their relation to the Roman Church. (3) Of their faith and liturgies during these eight centuries.

CHAPTER I

THE GREAT PATRIARCHATES

WHEN the Apostles were all dead, and when the extraordinary offices of Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, &c. (Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28), had gradually disappeared, we find that there remains a fixed hierarchy in each local Church. This hierarchy consists of the three fundamental orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In each city where there was a Christian community the Bishop "presided in the place of God"¹ in the town and in the country round. Assisting him in the liturgy and as a council, was a college of priests "in the place of a Senate of Apostles,"² and then came the Deacons "who are entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ"³ to preach, catechize, baptize, and take care of the poor. This hierarchy is fully developed in the 1st century. The letters of St. Ignatius, the martyr-bishop of Antioch († c. 107), are full of allusions to the three-fold order. "Let every one reverence the Deacons as Jesus Christ, so also the Bishop who is the type of the Father, and the Priests as the Senate of God and Council of the Apostles."⁴ And, as far as the inner organization of each community was concerned, this hierarchy was sufficient.⁵

¹ Ign. ad Magn. vi. 1.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ad Trall. iii. 1.

⁵ The only serious difficulty against the monarchical government of each diocese in the early Church is that St. Jerome (331-420) in one or two places (in Ep. ad Tit. i. 5; Ep. 146, ad Evangelum) says that a priest is the same as a bishop; that before the devil had sown discords among the faithful the Churches were governed by a council of priests; that bishops owe their

But a further organization arranged the relations of the bishops to each other; and from the beginning we find some bishops exercising jurisdiction over their fellow bishops beyond the boundaries of their own dioceses. Now the most important example of the authority of one bishop over others is the universal jurisdiction exercised by the Bishop of Rome over the whole Catholic Church. But this question has been so often discussed, the evidences of the Roman Primacy during the first centuries have been so often produced, that we need not dwell upon them again here. We see the Roman Church in the 1st century sternly commanding the Christians of Corinth (a city far away from her own diocese) to receive back their lawful ecclesiastical superiors, and concluding with just such words as a Pope would use to-day: "If they do not obey what he (God) says through us, let them know that they will be involved in no small crime and danger, but we shall be innocent of this sin."¹ We hear St. Ignatius greeting the "Presiding Church in the place of the Roman land," as the "president of the bond of love."² We know that the Greek Bishop of Lyons, St. Irenæus († 202), finding it too long to count up all the Churches, is content to quote against heretics "the greatest, most ancient and best known Church, founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome," because "every Church,

superiority over priests rather to custom than to our Lord's institution. Against this notice: (1) St. Jerome is much too late to be of any value as a witness. Centuries before his time we find monarchical episcopacy everywhere set up, everywhere accepted as a divine institution. (2) He wrote at the time of a quarrel between the priests of Alexandria and their bishop, in which he, himself only a priest, with his usual vehemence, took the side of his own order. (3) He in many other places plainly shows his consent in this question with the rest of the Christian world, *e.g.*, "Without leave of the bishop, neither priest nor deacon may baptize" (c. Lucif. n. 9); "What Aaron, his sons, and the Levites were in the temple, that are bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church" (Ep. 146). Even in the heat of the Alexandrine quarrel he asks: "What does a bishop do more than a priest, *except to ordain?*" (ibid.). Which is, of course, what makes all the difference.

¹ 1 Clem. ad Cor. 59, 1, 2.

² Ad Rom. Sal. These translations are not admitted by every one, but Funk's defence of them (Pp. Apost. *ad loc.* and *Kirchengesch. Abhdlgen.* i. 1) seems conclusive.

that is, the faithful from all parts, most agree with (or 'go to')¹ this Church on account of her mightier rule, and in her the tradition of the Apostles has always been kept by those who are from all sides." He then draws up the list of Popes from St. Peter to Eleutherius (177-189) his contemporary.² But this authority of the Pope belongs to general Church History : and we shall come later to the evidence of the great Greek Fathers for it. Now we are chiefly concerned with the other cases of superior jurisdiction, especially among Eastern bishops.

From the beginning we find the bishops of the more important sees, of the chief towns of provinces for instance, exercising jurisdiction over the neighbouring Churches. There is no reason to suppose that this right had been formally handed over to them, still less was the arrangement an imitation of the Roman civil jurisdiction, at any rate in this first period. The reason of their authority was a very simple and a very natural one. It was to the great central cities that the Gospel had first been brought, it was from them that the faith had spread through the country around. The bishops of the chief towns ruled then over the oldest sees, in many cases they traced their line back to one of the Apostles, they had sent out missionaries to the neighbouring villages, and, when the time came to set up other sees near them, they naturally ordained the new bishops. Now the right or the custom of ordaining another bishop was for many centuries looked upon as involving a sort of vague jurisdiction over him. It produced the relationship of a "Fatherhood in Christ"; the new bishop looked up to his consecrator with gratitude and with filial piety.³ So before there was any formal legislation on the subject, the bishops and faithful of each province naturally looked upon the bishop of the oldest Church in the neighbourhood, from whom

¹ "Convenire" = *συμβαίνειν* (but the Greek is lost.) It seems impossible to settle which meaning is right: the word means either. Stieren (*Op. omnia Irenæi*, Leipzig, 1849), who has certainly no prejudice in favour of Rome, declares for "to agree with."

² There is a careful examination of this famous passage (*adv. Haer.* III, 3) in Wilmer's *De Christi Ecclesia* (Regensburg, 1897), pp. 218, *seq.*

³ We shall see throughout our history how important the right to consecrate the bishops of any country was considered.

they had received the faith and holy orders, who was the connecting link between them and the Apostles, as their natural chief. They appealed to him in disputes, they followed his liturgical use, and they found it natural that, if there was a scandal among them, he should come to put it right. These central bishops were what we call *Metropolitans* or *Archbishops*.¹ Thus, Carthage was the head of the African Church, Alexandria of Egypt, Antioch of Syria, Ephesus of Asia, Heraclea of Thrace, &c. These metropolitans visited the sees around, ordained the bishops and, when synods began to be called, they summoned them and presided over them. But the organization went further. Just as several bishops were joined under one metropolitan, so the chief metropolitan of a country stood as the head of his fellows. These chief metropolitans were in some cases afterwards called *Exarchs*; three of them long before the Council of Nicæa stand out from all others as the three first bishops of Christendom. These three are the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The name *Patriarch*, like nearly all ecclesiastical titles, was at first used more vaguely; even as late as the 4th century, it is still applied to any specially venerable bishop.² Several reasons combined to give these three Patriarchs (we may already call them by what eventually became their special title) the first three places. Rome was of course always the first see, and both the others also claimed a descent from the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter; Antioch was where he had first sat, Alexandria was considered as having been founded by him through his disciple, St. Mark. Moreover these three bishops stood at the head of three sharply divided lands; Rome stood for Italy and for all

¹ The name Metropolitan is first used as their specific title in the 4th century (Metropolis is the chief town of a Roman province). About the same time appear the synonyms Exarch and Archbishop. Since the 9th century Archbishop has become the regular name in the West, while in the East they are still called Metropolitans. The name Exarch has since changed its meaning: Cf. Aichner: *Comp. iuris Can.* (Brixen, 1900), pp. 385, *seq.*

² St. Gregory Naz. († c. 390) says: "The older bishops or, to speak more suitably, the patriarchs" (Orat. 42, 23). The name is here only an application from the Old Testament, just as deacons were called Levites. In the West as late as the 6th century, we find Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon, called "the venerable Patriarch" (Acta SS. Febr. III, 742—Vita Romani, 2).

the Latin-speaking West, that she was gradually converting ; Alexandria was the capital of the old kingdom of Egypt, which through all changes had kept its own language (Coptic was spoken there till the Arab conquest) and individuality ; and Antioch was the head of Syria. Lastly, before Constantinople was built, these three were the three most important towns in the Empire. So when the first general council met at Nicæa in 325 it only confirmed what had already long been recognized : " Let the ancient custom be maintained in Egypt, Libya and the Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all these places, just as is the custom for the Bishop in Rome. In the same way in Antioch and the other provinces the Churches shall keep their rights" (Can. 6 Nic.).¹ The Canon goes on to say that if any one becomes a bishop without the knowledge of his metropolitan " this great synod declares that it is not meet for such a one to be a bishop."

This, then, is the first stage of the development. When the Fathers of Nicæa met, on every side were metropolitans ruling over provinces of suffragan bishops, and, high above all others, stood the three great Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.

It will be convenient to add here something about these three greatest sees.

1. Rome.

We must first of all carefully distinguish the patriarchal dignity and rights from those the Pope has as Vicar of Christ and visible Head of the whole Catholic Church, that is, from his Papal rights. The distinction is really quite a simple one. The Pope is, and his predecessors always have been (1) Bishop of Rome ; (2) Metropolitan of the Roman Province ; (3) Primate of Italy ; (4) Patriarch of the West ; (5) Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church. Each of these titles involved different rights and different relations to the faithful : to the citizens of his own city he is Bishop, Metropolitan, Primate, Patriarch, and Pope all in one ; to us in England he is neither local bishop, nor metropolitan, nor primate, but Patriarch and Pope ; to Catholics

¹ In our *Corpus Iuris Can.* D. 65, c. 6.

of Eastern rites he is not Patriarch, but only Pope. It is true that the Papal dignity is so enormously greater than any of the others that it tends to overshadow them; it is also true that one cannot always say exactly in which capacity the Pope acts—in earlier ages especially Popes were probably often not explicitly conscious themselves. On the other hand, as soon as we begin to discuss the relations of the Eastern Churches to the Pope, the distinction between his positions as Western Patriarch and as universal Pope becomes very important. We shall hear of fierce disputes as to the limits of the Roman Patriarchate carried on by people who entirely admitted the Pope's universal jurisdiction as Pope:¹ and now that the "Orthodox" Churches no longer acknowledge him as Pope they still recognize him as Patriarch of the West—indeed, still count him as the first of the great Patriarchs.

The Roman Patriarchate, then, as distinct from the Papacy, covered, at the time of the Council of Nicæa, the same territory as has always since been conceded to her by every one, namely, first Italy, and then all the undefined Western lands where Latin was spoken officially, all the tribes of barbarians who came immediately under the influence of Rome, whom she had converted or would convert in future. At Nicæa the Papal Legate, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, signs the decrees in the name of "the Church of Rome, and the Churches of Italy, Spain, and all the West."² It was only on the Eastern side, where the Roman Patriarchate touched the others (or, rather, the new one of Constantinople), that in after years her boundaries were disputed. We shall hear of the questions of Illyricum and the Bulgarian Church. Not only as universal Pope, but also because of his enormously largest territory, as successor of the Prince of the Apostles, as Bishop of the mighty

¹ E. A. Freeman ("The Eastern Church," *Edin. Rev.* 1858) thought that one of these disputes (about Illyricum) is an argument against the Papacy. The Pope was fighting for a limited jurisdiction (whether Illyricum belonged to him or to Constantinople); how, then, says Freeman, could he have been claiming an unlimited one, as he does now? Of course, the limit of his Patriarchate no more affects the question of his rights as Pope than do the limits of the diocese of Rome.

² Mansi, ii. 882, 927.

city that was Queen of the world, that had given her name to all the Empire, was the Roman Pontiff always, without question, the first of the Patriarchs.

2. Alexandria.

Before the rise of Constantinople the second city of the Empire was the Port of Egypt. Her only possible rival would have been Antioch; but Antioch was inland, whereas all the commerce of the eastern Mediterranean poured into the great harbour of Alexandria. And behind that harbour lay the greatest, richest, and most civilized city of the East. In the time of the Ptolemies the number of her inhabitants reached a million;¹ she had, besides her Greeks and native Egyptians, a large and privileged colony of Jews. Her museum (in Cæsar's time it counted seven hundred thousand books), her sumptuous palace, her three great harbours, with the famous lighthouse, her philosophical schools, combined to make Alexandria one of the wonders of the world. As soon as the Christian faith began to spread beyond Palestine, no city called to its Apostles more clearly than Alexandria; nowhere was the new teaching more eagerly discussed than among the crowd of scholars of every race who had flocked together to use her library. Tradition said that St. Mark the Evangelist had been the first missionary and first Bishop of Alexandria; and his successors boasted through him a connection with St. Peter, who had ordained him and sent him as his own representative. This descent from St. Peter, however, is a later idea, and a conscious imitation of Rome and Antioch. St. Mark's first successors were Anianus, Abilius, Cerdon, &c.

Many causes combined to give the Bishop of Alexandria the first place among Eastern bishops. Besides the fame of his city and his claim of succession from St. Peter, there was his great Christian school of philosophy. Pantæus († c. 212) founded at Alexandria a catechetical school that became the first Christian university; his disciple, Titus Flavius Clemens (Clement of Alexandria, † 217), and most of all Origen († 254), the greatest scholar and most wonderful genius of his age, both

¹ Diodorus Sic. 17, 52.

of whom were its presidents, spread the fame of their school throughout the Christian world. It was Origen especially who lent to Christian Alexandria the lustre of his almost incredible knowledge, the fame of his spotless life and of his heroic sufferings for the faith, and then, as a last legacy, the disputes about the orthodoxy of his works that lasted for centuries, until the fifth general council (Constantinople II in 553, Can. 11) declared him a heretic. It may be noted here that this Christian Neo-platonic school of Alexandria was never considered quite safe from the point of view of orthodoxy. Pope Benedict XIV, in his Bull "Postquam intelleximus" (1748), refuses to Clement the honours of a saint, because of the suspicion of want of orthodoxy in his works.¹ Nevertheless, the school, and Origen especially, exercised an enormous influence on Christian, especially Greek, theology.

The Church of Alexandria had other great names to boast of besides those of her philosophers. Among her bishops she counted St. Dionysius the Great (247-264), Alexander (313-328), who excommunicated Arius, greatest of all his successor St. Athanasius (328-373), and then St. Cyril of Alexandria (412-444). Because of the fame of her learning the Church of Alexandria had the office of making the astronomical calculations for the Christian Calendar. Eusebius (H.E. v. 25) has preserved a fragment of a letter of the Syrian bishops in which they say that they calculate Easter according to the use of Alexandria. The last cause of the great position of the Bishop of Alexandria was the compactness, the strong national feeling, and the faithful obedience of his province. He was the chief of Christian Egypt. From his throne by the sea he ruled over all the faithful of the Roman provinces of Egypt, Thebais and Libya, from his city the faith had spread throughout the country; he ordained all the bishops; under him were nine metropolitans and over one hundred bishops.² South of Egypt and outside the Empire were the two Churches of *Ethiopia* and *Nubia*, each of them founded from Alexandria,³ where their metropolitans

¹ "Opera sin minus erronea, saltem suspecta."

² Alexander could summon over one hundred bishops to his synod against Arius in 321.

³ Ethiopia in the time of St. Athanasius, Nubia in the 6th century.

have always been ordained, and who looked to the Patriarch of that city as their chief too. Egypt was also full of monks who were as ready as the bishops at any time to strike a blow for their Patriarch. And so in all the disputes in the Eastern Church, at all the councils the "ecclesiastical Pharaoh"¹ appeared leading a compact band of Egyptians, ready to show the national feeling, which the Empire had crushed politically, by voting in Church matters like one man for their chief. Before Constantinople arose the successors of St. Mark were without question the mightiest bishops in the East.² As their rivals on the Bosphorus were working their way up, the opponent they had most to fear was Alexandria. Whenever the See of Constantinople was vacant Alexandria was ready with a candidate to represent her interests, on whose side she could throw the enormous weight of all Egypt. Three times she deposed a Bishop of Constantinople—St. John Chrysostom in 403, Nestorius in 431, Flavian in 449; each time the other Eastern bishops meekly accepted her decision.³ Doubtless the Christian Pharaoh would have remained the head of the Eastern Churches, and all the development of their history would have been different, had not heresy broken his power and given Constantinople her chance. And then the flood of Islam completed his ruin. It was Monophysism that crushed both Alexandria and Antioch, to leave Constantinople without a real rival in the East. Monophysism to the Egyptians stood for a national cause against the Emperor's Court. They thought it had been the teaching of their national hero, St. Cyril. Dioscur, Patriarch of Alexandria (444-451), St. Cyril's successor, took up its cause hotly. But it was rejected by the universal Church; with it fell Dioscur, and with him the glory of his see. In 451 at Chalcedon he had to stand before the Fathers as a

¹ This name is often given to the Alexandrine Patriarch in the 4th and 5th centuries, both as a compliment and in mockery. St. Leo I writes about the "impenitent heart of the second Pharaoh" (Ep. 120 ad Theodoretum Cyri, 2), meaning Dioscur of Alexandria.

² Like the Bishops of Rome, they, too, were often called Popes (*πάππαι*).

³ The condemnation of Nestorius was confirmed in the Council of Ephesus in 431 by the Pope's Legates: St. Chrysostom and Flavian were always acknowledged by Rome, and were eventually restored.

culprit and to hear the Roman Legate (Paschasius, Bishop of Lilybæum) pronounce sentence on him: "The most holy and blessed Bishop of the great and elder Rome, Leo, through us and through the holy Synod here present in union with the blessed Apostle Peter, who is the corner-stone of the Catholic Church, deposes Dioscur from the office of bishop, and forbids him all ministry as priest" (Chalc. Sess. III). The Patriarchate of Alexandria never recovered from that humiliation. Dioscur refused to accept his deposition, and his Egyptians, always frantically loyal to their Pharaoh, supported him. But it was at the cost of separation from the Catholic world. Dioscur was banished to Paphlagonia, where he died in 455. Proterius was appointed Patriarch, and was supported by the Emperor's¹ soldiers. But Egypt hated equally Chalcedon and Cæsar. It was the old national feeling, the old hatred of the Roman power lurking under the dispute about one or two natures in Christ. As soon as Marcian died (457) the storm burst. They drove the soldiers into the temple of Serapis and there burned them alive; they murdered Proterius, and set up as Patriarch a fanatical Monophysite, Timothy the Cat.² It is from Dioscur and Timothy the Cat that the present national (Coptic) Church of Egypt descends. It has been ever since the 5th century out of the communion of both West and East, Rome and Constantinople. Meanwhile the party of the Government carried on another succession of Patriarchs, forming the "Melkite"³ community in union with Constantinople and (until the great schism) with Rome, but bitterly hated by the Copts. Neither of these rival Patriarchs ever attained anything like the influence of the old line from which both claimed to descend.

In 641 came the Moslems under Amr and swept them all away. So greatly did the Copts hate the Melkites that they supported the Arabs in the invasion. But they gained little by their

¹ Marcian (450-457) had accepted the decrees of Chalcedon as the law of the Empire, and everywhere enforced them by his civil power.

² Τιμόθεος Αἰλουρος.

³ *Malik* (Heb. *Melck*) is the Arabic for king. It was used by all the Semitic peoples (like the Greek *Βασιλεύς*) for the Emperor. Melkite then means βασιλικός, Imperial. Melkites are Christians on the Emperor's side, Imperialists.

treason. They were just as badly treated as the Imperial Christians, enormous numbers of them apostatized to Islam; and when, after about a century, the rival Patriarchs reappear, the Melkite bishop has become a mere ornament of the Court of Constantinople, the Copt is the head of a local sect. The great days when the Christian Pharaoh was the chief bishop of the East had gone for ever.

3. Antioch.

The third great city of the Empire was Antioch on the Orontes. Just as Alexandria was the chief town of Egypt, so was Antioch the head of Syria. The city had been built in 301 B.C. by Seleucus Nicator, the founder of the Seleucid kingdom of Syria: before the Roman conquest (64 B.C.) it had been enlarged with three great suburbs, and was already the greatest and most famous city of Asia. At various times Emperors had lived there—Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Diocletian—and they built great temples, baths, and palaces. No less famous were the memories of the Christian Church of Antioch. It was here that we were first called Christians (Acts xi. 26); a very ancient tradition counted St. Peter as the first Bishop of Antioch;¹ during the persecution this city gave to the Church a long list of martyrs. St. Peter's successor was Evodius, then followed the glorious martyr St. Ignatius († 107), who, on his way to be thrown to the beasts at Rome, wrote the seven letters that form the most valuable part of the "Apostolic Fathers." Constantine (323-337) built the "Golden Church" at Antioch, splendid with precious metals and mosaic, that became the type of one class of Christian church.² When Julian (361-363) on his way to Persia went to the grove of Daphne by Antioch to

¹ St. Jerome: *de vir. ill.* I, &c. St. Peter was said to have reigned at Antioch for seven years (37-44) before setting up his chair at Rome. Our feast of St. Peter's Chair at Antioch (Feb. 22nd) was at first only *Natale Petri de Cathedra*, kept on the day of the old Roman Memory of the Dead (*Cara Cognatio*). To call it the Chair at Antioch was an afterthought, to distinguish it from the other feast on Jan. 18th: Cf. de Rossi in the *Bollettino* of 1867, and Kellner, *Heortologie*, 1901, p. 173.

² An eight-sided plan, with a gallery in two stories around and apses jutting out from the sides. On this model were built St. Vitalis at Ravenna, Charles the Great's church at Aachen, Essen, &c.

offer sacrifice, he found that the Christian faith had so spread in the city that only one old priest was left to offer a goose to Apollo.¹

The Bishop of Antioch was the chief bishop of Syria. He was in the first period obeyed throughout Syria, Phœnicia, Arabia, Cilicia, Mesopotamia and Cyprus. But the people of these provinces with their different languages, customs and national feelings, never held together as much as the Egyptians. Antioch lost in the 5th century Palestine, that went to make up the new Patriarchate of Jerusalem (p. 27), and Cyprus, that became an autonomous province (p. 48). Just as the faith had spread out from Egypt beyond the Empire, so also to the east of Antioch, beyond the Euphrates, and therefore beyond the Empire, a Christian community had grown up in the kingdom of Osroene, whose capital was Edessa. The tradition of this Church told a pretty story of how King Abgar the Black² once sent an embassy of his nobles and a notary named Hannan to Tiberius. On their way back they pass by Jerusalem and hear every one in that city talk about the new Prophet from Galilee. Abgar's embassy stayed ten days in Jerusalem, and Hannan the notary wrote down everything that he saw and heard. Then they go home and tell their king what has happened. He sends Hannan back with a letter beginning: "Abgar the Black, Prince of Edessa, sends greeting to Jesus the good Saviour who has appeared in Jerusalem," and asking our Lord to come to Edessa and to heal him from leprosy. Our Lord writes back: "Happy art thou who hast believed in me without having seen me; for it is written that they who see me shall not believe, but they that do not see me shall believe in me." He goes on to say that he cannot go to Edessa, because: "I must fulfil that for which I am sent, and must then go back to him who sent me"; but he promises to send one of his Apostles, who shall heal Abgar; he also promises that Abgar's city shall always be blessed, and that no enemy shall ever overcome it.

Hannan then painted a portrait of our Lord, which he

¹ Misopogon, ed. Spanh. pp. 361, *seq.*

² Abgar Ukkama.

brought to Edessa with the letter. After the Ascension, St. Jude sent Thaddeus (whom they call Addai), who of course at once heals and converts King Abgar, and dies in peace, succeeded by his disciple Aggai. So did the faith come to Edessa.¹ This is the best known of the legends by which so many countries connected their Church immediately with our Lord and the Apostles. Eusebius tells it ;² the portrait of our Lord was famous all through the Middle Ages, and right over in England before the Conquest people wore a copy of his letter to Abgar as a protection "against lightning and hail, and perils by sea and land, by day and by night and in dark places."³ It seems true that the faith had been preached in Edessa before its conquest by Septimius Severus (193-211). As soon as these lands became part of the great Empire, their Church entered into closer relations with the Great Church. We hear of one Palut, who went up to Antioch to be ordained bishop. The authority for this early history of Edessa, the "Doctrine of Addai," is anxious to show the connection between its Church and the See of Peter. It tells us that Palut was ordained by Serapion of Antioch, Serapion by Zephyrinus of Rome, Zephyrinus by Victor, his predecessor, and so on back to St. Peter. From this Palut the bishops of Edessa traced their line. And so the Patriarch of Antioch counted these distant East Syrian Churches as part of his Patriarchate, too. From Edessa the faith spread to *Nisibis*, and when, after Julian's defeat and death (363), the Empire had to give up her border provinces to the Persians, the Christians of these lands still looked to the great bishop in Antioch as their chief, till the Nestorian heresy cut them off from the rest of Christendom.

Another daughter-Church of Antioch beyond the Empire was the Church of *Georgia*, or *Iberia*. The apostle of Iberia was a lady, St. Nino, who fled thither during the Diocletian persecution. The king Mirian was converted by her in 318 or 327.

¹ The Syrian "Doctrine of Addai." I quote from Hennecke, *NTliche Apokryphen* (1904), "Die Abgar Sage," pp. 76, seq.

² H.E. i. 13.

³ Kuyper's *Book of Cerne*, p. 205. The whole story is discussed in Burkitt : *Early Eastern Christianity* (1904), chap. i.

Mirian then sent to Constantine for bishops, and Eustathius of Antioch came with priests and deacons, and ordained a certain John as first Bishop of Iberia.¹ In the 4th century the bishop turned Arian and the king turned pagan. But the Church of Iberia got over that, and all went well for a time. In 455 *Tiflis* was built, and became the seat of the Metropolitan. In 601 Iberia was recognized as a separate Church province, independent of Antioch. Then came the Persians, and in the 7th century the Moslem conquest. For the further history of this Church see pp. 304-305.

Like Alexandria, Antioch had its school of theology, which, however, did not represent so consistent a tradition; it was also less famous than its rival. Serapion the Bishop (c. 192-209),² of whom we have heard as the consecrator of Palut of Edessa, wrote letters against various heretics (Montanists, &c.), of which Eusebius has preserved some fragments.³

The notorious Paul of Samosata was Bishop of Antioch from 260 till he was deposed in 269. But the first important name of the Antiochene school that we know is that of Lucian, priest and martyr († 311). He revised the Septuagint according to the Hebrew text, but was suspected of subordinationism, and Arius, who had learnt from him, was believed to have imbibed his heresy from his master. Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eustathius of Antioch (a faithful defender of the faith of Nicæa, ejected by an Arian synod in 330), Diodor of Tarsus († 394), Theodore of Mopsuestia († 429), the original father of Nestorianism, and Theodoret of Cyrus († 458) were the chief leaders of this school, which further influenced St. Cyril of Jerusalem († 386) and St. John Chrysostom († 407). St. John was ordained deacon and priest in his own city, Antioch, and preached there from 386 till he became Patriarch of Constantinople in 398.

The character of this school, as opposed to that of Alexandria, was, as far as the interpretation of Scripture went, great soberness and literalness. Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia denied the Messianic character of many Old Testament texts, and rejected the Song of Solomon as being obviously not divine. The

¹ Rufinus, H.E. i. 10.

² Harnack, *Altchristl. Litt.* (1893), p. 503.

³ H.E. v. 19. Cf. Hieron. de viris ill. xli.

daughter-school of Antioch was at Edessa, where a line of Syriac Fathers flourished—St. Ephrem (Afrēm, † 373), Aphraates (Afrāhat, † end of 4th century), Rabulas (Rabūla, † 435), Isaac the Great († c. 459), &c. But the Antiochene school, in spite of the fame of the Catholic Doctors who had belonged to it, was as suspect of unorthodoxy as its rival in Egypt. Theodore of Mopsuestia was a Nestorian, Theodoret of Cyrus was an opponent of St. Cyril of Alexandria,¹ and the school in general shared at least some of the Nestorian ill-fame that, after the Council of Ephesus, attached itself to Edessa.

It was about the See of Antioch that the greatest schism of the first four centuries took place (Meletius, p. 90). There is a very remarkable likeness between the history of the two great Eastern Patriarchates. Each of the Macedonian cities, Alexandria and Antioch, remained, after Alexander's Empire had broken up (B.C. 323), an outpost of Greek civilization in the midst of barbarians. Rome had swallowed up the Ptolemies, (B.C. 30) and the Seleucids (B.C. 64), but still these two cities remained Greek. The citizens of both spoke Greek, while all around the old barbarian populations of the lands (Egyptians and Syrians) clung to their own languages and customs, and hated the Roman Emperor as much as they had hated Alexander's generals. Both populations found in Church matters an outlet for their national and anti-imperial feeling. And so just as the greatness of the Church of Alexandria came to an end through the schism of the Egyptians, so did Antioch fall when her Syrians adopted heresies that had, at any rate, the advantage of not being Cæsar's religion. Lastly Islam poured over Antioch too.

In Syria both the opposite heresies, Nestorianism and Monophysism, helped to ruin the Church of Antioch. After the Council of Ephesus (431) nearly the whole of the eastern part of the patriarchate remained Nestorian. The writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia had spread this heresy all around Edessa and Nisibis, the school of Edessa was its chief centre,

¹ He died, in 458, in the communion of the Catholic Church; but his writing against Cyril was the second of Justinian's Three Chapters, as the works of Theodore Mopsuestia were the first (pp. 82-83).

and the Church that had grown up over the Persian frontier with a Metropolitan at Ktesiphon (near Baghdad on the Tigris) fell away too. So Antioch lost her Eastern provinces.

The kings of Persia, who had persecuted their Catholic subjects, were glad to encourage a form of Christianity that had no connection with the religion of the Roman Empire. Meanwhile the Emperor persecuted the heretics. In 489 Zeno (474-491) closed the school at Edessa, which was then reopened over the frontier at Nisibis, and large numbers of Syrian Nestorians fled to Persia.

But the other heresy, Monophysism, the extreme opposite of Nestorius's teaching, did still more harm to the Church of Antioch. Here what happened was almost an exact copy of what we saw in Egypt. A large proportion of Western Syrians would not accept the decrees of Chalcedon. Monophysism had one factor in common with its extreme antithesis, and a factor that commended it just as much—it was an opposition to the faith of the tyrant on the Bosphorus. For a time they succeed in getting a Monophysite appointed to the See of Antioch, then Justinian (527-565) tries to cut short their orders. Severus of Antioch (512-518) belonged to their party, but, after his death in 548 (he had been deposed and exiled in 518), the Government shut up all suspect bishops in monasteries to prevent them from ordaining any successors. But the Empress Theodora was their friend. At Constantinople she arranges for two Monophysite monks to be ordained bishop, Theodore and James Zanzalos. Theodore was to go to Bostra and have jurisdiction over all the Monophysites of Arabia and Palestine; James to Edessa for Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor (543). Theodore disappeared without leaving a trace; James Zanzalos travelled all over the East, and built up an anti-Chalcedonian hierarchy. In Egypt he finds two Coptic bishops imprisoned in a convent. Secretly with them he ordains other bishops, among them Sergius of Tella, for Antioch. This Sergius begins the rival line of Monophysite Patriarchs. He has on his side nearly all the Syrian population: the Orthodox bishop rules over only the Government party of Greeks (called Melkites here, as in Egypt) in the capital. James had the honour of giving his name to the

sect. He was also called James Baradaï because he went about in rags,[†] and from the name James (Ia'qob) the Syrian Monophysites are called Jacobites (Ia'qobaie). These Jacobites have ever since been out of communion with the rest of the Christian world, only keeping up irregularly friendly relations with the Copts. So between the Nestorians and the Jacobites the Orthodox pastor at Antioch lost nearly all his sheep. Then came Omar with his Moslems in 637, and swept over all Syria and Persia. The Melkite Patriarch fled to Constantinople, where he was content with a subordinate place under the "Œcumenical Bishop." The Orthodox See of Antioch had fallen as low as that of Alexandria, and here, too, there was no one left to dispute the ambition of Constantinople.

We must now go back to the 4th century to trace the rise of other sees. We saw that at Nicæa in 325 the dignity of the three great patriarchal thrones at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch was accepted as an "ancient custom."

It seemed for a time as if two other sees would also develop into great patriarchates. These sees were *Cæsarea* in Cappadocia, and *Ephesus*. But their career was cut short, and their bishops never became more than Exarchs or, as we should now say, Primates, the Bishop of Ephesus over Asia (that is, the Roman province of Asia), the Bishop of Cæsarea over Pontus. Now here it is impossible not to recognize a conscious imitation of the Roman civil divisions. Diocletian (284-305) had divided the Empire very skilfully when he shared the government with Maximian and the two Cæsars, Constantius Chlorus and Galerius. There were four great *Prefectures*, *Gaul* (i.e., Spain, Gaul, Britain) under Constantius Chlorus, *Italy* (Italy and Africa) under Maximian, *Illyricum* (Dacia, Macedonia, Greece, Crete=nearly all the Balkan lands) under Galerius; lastly, the Prefecture of the *East* (Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt) under Diocletian himself. Each of these prefectures was divided into civil "*dioceses*" under vicars (vicarii), the dioceses were divided into *provinces* under governors (præsides, ἡγεμόνες). Undoubtedly this organization was a very convenient one for the Church to adopt; the dioceses formed compact and coherent divisions,

[†] Barda'ta is a rag in Syriac,

each with a chief town where the Vicar lived, to which the main roads led. Nothing was more natural than to accept these boundaries and to give central authority to the bishops of the central towns. We shall see afterwards how this idea, that the Church must follow the State in her organization, became almost a first principle with the Eastern bishops.¹

The way it worked out then was this : Roughly each Roman province became an ecclesiastical province, to the Governor corresponded a Metropolitan, the civil dioceses tended to become ecclesiastically unions of Metropolitans under an Exarch or Primate, who would answer to the Vicar ; and the Prefectures became more or less equivalent to Patriarchates. But the parallel does not really fit so exactly. All three Western Prefectures (Gaul, Italy, Illyricum) went to make up the huge Roman Patriarchate. There only remained the Prefecture of the East² to divide among all the others. The five civil dioceses of this Eastern Prefecture were :—(1) *Thrace* in Europe, from the Hellespont to the Danube and westward to the border of Dacia by Philippopolis (chief town Constantinople) ; (2) *Asia, i.e.,* Mysia, Lydia, Pisidia, and part of Phrygia (chief town Ephesus) ; (3) *Pontus, i.e.,* Galatia, Paphlagonia, Pontus, and Cappadocia (chief town Cæsarea) ; (4) *The Diocese of the East*, containing Syria, Palestine, and eastward to the Persian frontier (chief town Antioch) ;³ and lastly (5) *Egypt* (chief town Alexandria).⁴ Of these five State dioceses two, Egypt and the "East," corresponded to the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch. There remained the other three, *Thrace, Asia, Pontus*. It seems, then, to have been the influence

¹ It had certainly not been so in earlier times. At the end of the 2nd century the bishops of Cæsarea, Jerusalem, Ptolemais, Tyre, &c., meet in a provincial council (Eus. H.E. v. 23, *seq.*). But Tyre and Ptolemais belonged civilly to the province of Syria, Jerusalem and Cæsarea to Palestine : Cf. Duchesne, *Orig. du Culte chrétien*, p. 18.

² *Præfectura Orientis*. The Prefecture of the East must not be confused with the Diocese of the East, which was one of its divisions (the fourth).

³ A Count of the East (*Comes Orientis*) ruled over this diocese at Antioch.

⁴ There is a good map of the Empire in prefectures and dioceses in the atlas to Freeman's *Historical Geography of Europe*, ed. by Prof. Bury (Longmans, 1903). Compare with this the map "Orbis Christianus, sec. i-vi." in Kirsch's new edition of Hergenröther's *Kirchengeschichte I*.

of the civil arrangement that caused the Bishop of Ephesus to be considered Primate over the Metropolitans of Asia, and the Bishop of Cæsarea to become Primate of Pontus. Thrace belonged at first to Heraclea, and then became the share of the Bishop of Constantinople, as we shall see.

In 381 the second general council (Constantinople I) accepts this hierarchy. Its second Canon says : " Bishops who are outside their diocese shall not go up (*ἐπιέναι*) to Churches outside their frontiers, and shall not confuse the Churches ; but, according to the Canons, the Bishop of Alexandria shall only rule over Egypt, the bishops of the East shall only govern the East, keeping the Primacy (*τὰ πρεσβεία*) of the Church of Antioch, according to the Canons of Nicæa. And the bishops of the dioceses of Asia shall rule over Asia only, those of Pontus over Pontus only, those of Thrace over Thrace only." ¹

The council means to stop bishops from wandering about outside their own diocese and then suddenly appearing at local synods of other countries and interfering in affairs with which they ought to have no business. It tells the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch to stay at home and look after their own patriarchates. The Fathers do not, of course, think of speaking so to the Roman Patriarch, because they know that he is also Pope and has jurisdiction over the whole Christian world. But what interests us here is that they go on to mention the three other civil dioceses of the Eastern Prefecture, and so draw up a list of just these five divisions made by the Empire—Egypt, the " East," Asia, Pontus, and Thrace.

The Diocese of Thrace concerns Heraclea and Constantinople, to which we shall presently come back. A word may here be added about the other two, Asia (Ephesus) and Pontus (Cæsarea) before we finally lose sight of them. Both these Sees of Ephesus and Cæsarea had illustrious records. *Ephesus* kept the sacred memory of her first bishop, St. John the Apostle.

¹ It should be added that this little council of one hundred and fifty bishops was only gradually recognized as œcumenical by the West, and that only its dogmatic decrees and not the disciplinary canons, which already show anti-Western feeling, are accepted by Rome. Nevertheless this Canon II is in our *Corpus Iuris*, C. ix. ¶ ii. c. 8.

In the seven letters at the beginning of the Apocalypse she saw a clear proof of his primatial authority over these seven Asiatic Churches. And so for a time the Bishops of Ephesus as Primates or Exarchs of Asia took the fifth place in the hierarchy (after Jerusalem). Only once did one of them receive a faint shadow of what might have become his dignity. In 475 Timothy the Cat of Alexandria, in order to win the Exarch of Ephesus for his campaign against Chalcedon, affects to give him the dignity of a Patriarch.¹ *Cæsarea* in Cappadocia was one of the Apostolic Churches. On Whit-Sunday "those who dwell in Cappadocia" heard the Apostles speak their own tongue (Acts ii. 9) ; St. Peter greets the Elect of the dispersion in Cappadocia (1 Pet. i. 1). And *Cæsarea* (*Mazaca*) became a centre from which the Christian faith was propagated. The Church of *Armenia* was founded, or at any rate re-constituted,² by St. Gregory the Illuminator (3rd century), a prince of the Armenian royal house, who had fled to *Cæsarea*, was converted there, and then went back home to be the apostle of his people. So *Cæsarea* also had a daughter-Church outside the Empire. Till the middle of the 5th century the Armenian Exarch (the *Katholikos*) was always ordained by the Exarch of *Cæsarea*. But the Church of *Armenia*, in a synod at *Valarshapat* in 491, rejected the decrees of Chalcedon, and she has ever since remained in schism with *Cæsarea* and with the Church of the Empire. The Armenian Monophysites could not even arrange a union with their co-religionists the Syrian Jacobites.

Firmilian, the friend of St. Cyprian and the sharer of his mistake about heretic baptism, was Bishop of *Cæsarea* from 232 to 269. But the greatest names among the bishops of this city are Eusebius (b. 265, Bp. c. 313, † c. 340), the Father of Church History, and, greater still, St. Basil (b. c. 330, Bp. 370, † 379), one of the most famous of all the Greek Fathers. But neither

¹ Evagr. H.E. iii. 6, seq. Cf. Duchesne, *Églises séparées*, p. 168.

² The Armenian tradition says that four Apostles had brought the faith to this land—SS. Bartholomew, Thaddæus, Simon and Jude. There certainly were Armenian bishops before St. Gregory. Dionysius of Alexandria (248–265) wrote a letter about penance to Meruzan, "Bishop of the Armenians" (Eus. H.E. vi. 46).

of these exarchates, Ephesus and Cæsarea, had a chance of developing into patriarchates ; they were swallowed up by Constantinople, and sank back to the position of ordinary metropolitan Churches.

We now come to the other two sees that eventually made up, with the three older and greater ones, the classical number of five patriarchates. These sees are *Jerusalem* and *Constantinople*.

4. Jerusalem.

The position of the Bishop of Jerusalem was quite an extraordinary one. During the time of the Apostles his Church had been the centre of the Jewish Christian community. It was, of course, an Apostolic See, counting its bishops from St. James the Less, the "Brother of the Lord" (Gal. i. 19). But the Emperor Adrian (117-138) had expelled all Jews from the city in 135 ; the very name Jerusalem was to disappear—in its place stood the heathen colony Aelia Capitolina. The Christian Jews had to leave just as much as the others ; already most of them had fled at the first destruction of the city (70) to the little Greek town Pella in Peræa. So in some sort the original Church of Jerusalem had come to an end. After Adrian's time we find only a small and poor community of Gentile Christians in Aelia Capitolina, still, however, governed by an unbroken line of bishops. Now Aelia was in the civil division of the Empire a town of no importance at all ; it was not one of Diocletian's chief towns. The Governor of the Province of Palestine lived at Cæsarea (in Palestine), as he had when St. Paul was sent there to be tried by Felix the Governor (Acts xxiii. 23, *seq.*). So for a time the Bishop of Aelia was only a local bishop under the Metropolitan of Cæsarea in Palestine. And yet inevitably he was looked upon as something more than just the equal of any other bishop. Call the city Aelia Capitolina or what you will, to Christians it was always Jerusalem, Sion, the Holy City to them as much as to the Jews. This bishop ruled over the places where our Saviour had suffered and died, where the Holy Ghost had descended on the Apostles, where, as they thought, the Lord

would soon appear again on the great day to judge the living and the dead. The eyes of the whole Christian world were turned towards the land still fragrant with the memory of that sacred presence, to the streets hallowed by his blessed foot-prints, to the hill outside the city that had been the one great Altar. And very soon they began to come from all sides to see the holy places for themselves. In the 4th century, Egeria,¹ a Spanish lady, wrote a careful diary of all the rites she had seen at Jerusalem when she went on a pilgrimage thither; in St. Jerome's time (331-420) pilgrims came to the Holy Land even from distant Britain.²

Jerusalem was naturally the first, as well as the chief, place to which people made pilgrimage. And when they were there they found themselves under the jurisdiction of the successor of St. James; they eagerly watched the rites of his diocese; it was no ordinary bishop whose Palm Sunday procession entered the gates of the real Jerusalem, whose Easter Mass was said over the Holy Sepulchre itself. So we find that the Bishop of Aelia Capitolina, very naturally, receives a sort of honorary primacy, a distinctive place due to the unique dignity of his Church, yet without any disarrangement of the order of the hierarchy. So the Fathers of Nicæa (325) in their 7th Canon: "Since custom and ancient tradition had obtained that the bishop in Aelia be honoured, let him have the succession of honour (*ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς*), saving, however, the domestic rights of the Metropolis (*τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος*)."³

The "succession of honour" means a place of honour, apparently next after the Patriarchs; nevertheless the Metropolitan (of Cæsarea, Pal.) is to keep his rights over the Bishop of Aelia.

But these bishops were not content with their "succession of honour"; they wanted to be independent of Cæsarea, even of the great Patriarch at Antioch.

When the Council of Ephesus met (431) the See of Jerusalem

¹ She used to be confused with St. Sylvia of Aquitaine: Cf. Röhrich, *Bibliotheca Geographica Palæstinæ*, Berlin, 1890, pp. 2, 3, &c.

² Ep. 44, ad Paulam; Ep. 84, ad Oceanum.

³ This Canon is in our C.I.C. dist. 65, c. 7.

was occupied by Juvenal (420-458). He appeared at the council, and made a great attempt to have his see recognized as independent. But this first time he did not succeed. St. Cyril of Alexandria opposed him, and Pope Leo the Great blamed his ambition in a letter to Maximus of Antioch.¹ However, he got the Emperor Theodosius II (408-450) on his side. Theodosius—it is one of the endless number of cases in which the Emperors usurped jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters—pretended to cut all Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia off from Antioch, and to give them to the Bishop of Jerusalem, to make up a new patriarchate for him. Of course the Patriarch of Antioch, whose territory was thus very considerably reduced, protested against the Emperor's action, and the dispute lasted for twenty years, till the next general council in 451 at Chalcedon. Here the Fathers in the seventh and eighth sessions at last arranged a compromise. Jerusalem was made a patriarchate, but only a very small one; Phœnicia was to remain under the jurisdiction of Antioch, Jerusalem was to have only Palestine and Arabia.² The Council "in Trullo" (Quinisextum, 692) counted Jerusalem as the fifth see, that is, as the fifth and last of the patriarchates.³

The bishops of the Holy City counted several great names among those of their predecessors since St. James; Macarius (313-333) found the true cross with St. Helen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem (351-386) was a Father of the Church whose Catechism is the most famous of its kind, Juvenal, as we have seen, succeeded in turning his see into a patriarchate, Sophronius (634-638) was a staunch upholder of the faith of Chalcedon, and the witness of the capture of his city by the Saracens. But Monophysism spread very rapidly in Palestine, as in Syria, and cut off many of the Christians of this little patriarchate from the communion of the Catholic Church. And then, in 637, came Omar the Khalifah (634-644). After the battle of Ajnadin, Jerusalem had no chance of holding out any longer against the

¹ Ep. 119, ad Maximum, 2.

² Hefele, *Konziliengesch.* II, pp. 477 and 502. Arabia means that part of the peninsula that belonged to the Empire, *i.e.*, Sinai.

³ Can. 36: "and after these he of the city of Jerusalem."

Moslem. Sophronius begged to be allowed to surrender the city to the Khalifah himself; Omar agreed, travelled with one single attendant to Jerusalem, promised the Christians the possession of their churches and freedom of worship on the usual condition—a poll-tax, and then entered the city side by side with the Patriarch, discussing its antiquities. It is said that Omar refused to pray in the Anastasis (the Church of the Holy Sepulchre) for fear that afterwards his followers might make his example an excuse for turning it into a mosque, in spite of the treaty. So the Anastasis has always been a Christian church, and the Moslem conquest of Jerusalem did not at first involve any great suffering. But the city that had been Aelia Capitolina now became the Mohammedan “Holy Place”; and when, after an interval of fifty years, John V (in 705) succeeded Sophronius, the Church of Jerusalem was reduced to a subject-community of Christians in a corner of the great Saracen Empire. The Patriarch of Jerusalem has ever since been the poorest of his kind,¹ and for many centuries he was content to live at Constantinople as an official of that Patriarch’s Court.

5. Constantinople.

We come lastly to the story of the rise of Constantinople. The most significant development among the Eastern Churches, indeed the connecting link of the unity of their history, is the evolution of the See of Constantinople from being the smallest of local dioceses to the position of first Church of all Eastern Christendom, so great that her bishops even ventured to think themselves the rivals of the Roman Pope, so influential that when at last they fell into formal schism they dragged all the other Eastern bishops with them. It is the most significant development and the latest: it was, moreover, this ambition of the bishops of the Imperial City that far more than anything else caused and fostered friction with Rome, so that if one looks for the deeper causes of the schism, one realizes that it was not the Filioque in the Creed, not the question of leaven or unleavened bread, not the rights of Ignatius the Patriarch that really

¹ He is richer now, because the Russians send enormous sums of money to the Holy Land.

drove a wedge between the two halves of the Christian Church. It was, long before the 9th century, the slowly climbing ambition of Constantinople that bred mutual jealousy and hatred; the thin end of the wedge was when, in 381, the Bishop of Constantinople was given the "precedence of honour after the Bishop of Rome."

But the first development of this see was not made at the cost of Rome, but at that of the Eastern Patriarchs around her. At first no bishop was smaller than the Bishop of Byzantium. He was not even a metropolitan. Centuries afterwards, when he had become the first of Eastern prelates, when he was jealously trying to rival the unquestioned Primacy of Rome, he tried to hide the humble beginning of his see. To be of any great importance a bishop had to count his diocese among the Apostolic Churches. There was really no question of anything of the kind in the case of Constantinople; all her greatness came from the presence of the Emperor and his Court. But in the 9th century especially, a story went about that the first Bishop of Byzantium had been St. Andrew the Apostle; his successor then was the Stachys mentioned in Rom. xvi. 9. This story is found in a forgery attributed to one Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyrus, and martyr under Diocletian. It served its turn in fighting Rome, but has now long been given up.

Really the first Bishop of Byzantium of whom we hear was Metrophanes at the time of Constantine (323-337). And he was a local bishop of Thrace under the Metropolitan of Heraclea. The bishops of this small city would no doubt have remained in that position, and Heraclea would have become an exarchate over Thrace, as Ephesus over Asia and Cæsarea over Pontus, but for one most important fact that changed the whole development of Eastern Church history. In 330 Constantine "turned the Eagle back against the course of heaven,"¹ moved

¹ Posciachè Constantin l'aquila volse
Contra il corso del ciel, ch'ella seguio
Dietro all'antico che Lavina tolse,
Cento e cent'anni e più l'uccel di Dio
Nell'estremo d'Europa si ritenne,
Vicino ai monti de'quai prima uscio.

Par. vi. 1-6.

the seat of his Government to Byzantium, built the great and famous city that still bears his name, and carried off all the ornaments of old Rome that he could remove to decorate his new capital. Byzantium became Constantinople, New Rome, and was to be legally in every way equal to the old city. The bishop of the new capital soon began to share its dignity. In the first place, as we have seen (p. 21), there was a tendency to imitate civil divisions and civil positions in the hierarchy of the Church. If that were so, if the position of a bishop were to be measured according to the rank of the city where he sat, who would be so great as the bishop of the capital of the whole Empire?

The pastors of the little town in the Province of Heraclea had now indeed an intoxicating opportunity of advancement. Were they to remain subject to a metropolitan? Should they not be, at least, as great as their brothers of Alexandria and Antioch? Nay, since the laws of the State were apparently to be the criterion, no position would seem too high for their ambition. Might not Cæsar's own bishop—the honoured chaplain of his Court, who stood side by side with the highest ministers of the Empire before their master, the bishop of the city that was now the centre of the Roman world—might not he even hope to be counted as great as that distant Patriarch, left alone among the ruins by the Tiber? One can understand his ambition; and the Emperors encouraged it. Throughout this story we shall see that the Emperors, while they themselves dealt most masterfully with their Court bishop, still used every means to get his position raised in the hierarchy. It was part of their policy of centralization; it helped to rivet the loyalty of their subjects to their city, through their own bishop they could the more easily govern the Church. Indeed, nowhere does the tyranny of Cæsar over the things of God, which characterizes the policy of these Emperors, show so clearly as in their dealings with their bishops at Constantinople; nowhere is there a more degrading example of subjection to the civil government than the mingled contempt and furtherance that these bishops received from the Emperor. There was also convenience in this new position of the Court bishop. He had the ear of Cæsar, he was

in some sort his private chaplain. When from distant parts of the Empire cases of Church discipline were to be presented to the Government for its support, the Bishop of Constantinople was there to push on the case. He became a sort of permanent agent at the Court, always able to transact business for others. His household of priests and suffragan bishops gradually became a permanent synod that the Emperor could always consult before issuing laws about Church affairs.¹ Constantine had been content to let the Church govern herself and to remain only the "bishop of things outside,"² but his successors continually pretended to determine questions of faith by Imperial decrees. In this policy they found an ever-ready helper in their Court bishops. During all the centuries in which these Emperors were trying to bring the Church under the same subjection as the State their most steadfast opponents were the Popes of Old Rome, their most servile agents the Patriarchs of New Rome. The story, then, of the rise of the See of Constantinople is not a creditable one. It had no splendid traditions from the earliest age; it had none of the lustre of Apostolic origin; its dignity could not be compared with that of the old patriarchates, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch; it had nothing of the sacred associations of Jerusalem. A new see, in itself of no importance, its claims were pushed solely because of a coincidence that had nothing to do with the Church. It was only because of the presence of the Emperor and through his tyrannical policy that the Church of his city managed to usurp the first place among the Eastern Churches, and at last to lead them all in a campaign against the See of St. Peter. We must now trace the steps of this evolution.

We saw that at the Council of Nicæa (325) the "ancient custom" was recognized by which the three great Sees of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch "kept their rights." At that time Constantine had not yet set up his new capital. Jerusalem was to have a place of honour, Byzantium was not even mentioned. It was still a small local Church under the Metropolitan of Heraclea.

¹ This became the *Σύνοδος ἐνδημῶνσα* (Kattenbusch : *Confessionesk.* i. 86).

² "You (the bishops) are for the interior affairs of the Church; I have been appointed by God the bishop of the things outside" (Eusebius: *Vita Const.* iv. 24).

But fifty-six years later, when the second general council met at Constantinople itself (381), things had changed. Nectarius was Bishop, now no longer of Byzantium, but of New Rome, and already there was growing up among the Eastern bishops some jealousy of the Roman Patriarch. So they thought to make perhaps some counterpoise to his great authority by exalting their Greek fellow-countryman in the city of Cæsar. Now we must here first of all remember that of all the councils that we count as œcumenical, two became so only through the later acceptance of the whole Church and of the Pope. These two were the second (this one, Constantinople I in 381) and the fifth (Constantinople II in 553). The Council of 381, then, was œcumenical neither in its summoning nor in its sessions. It was a comparatively small synod of one hundred and fifty Eastern bishops, summoned by the Emperor Theodosius I (379-395). There were no Latin bishops present, the See of Rome was not represented ; the presidents of the council were, first, Meletius of Antioch, then St. Gregory of Nazianzum, then Nectarius of Constantinople. At the Synod of Ariminum in 359, for instance, more than four hundred bishops were present. We must also note that the Church of Rome, and the West generally, only accepted the dogmatic definition of the Council of Constantinople¹ and not its disciplinary Canons.² The 3rd Canon, then, has for us Catholics only a historic interest, as a step in the process by which the claims of Constantinople were gradually accepted by the other Eastern bishops. Indeed, this 3rd Canon was quite specially rejected by the Pope. It says this : " The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy of honour (τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς) after the Bishop of Rome, because that city is New Rome (διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην)." It is not quite easy to understand exactly what this Canon means. But whatever it may be that these Fathers meant to give to the Bishop of Constantinople, they made no pretence about the

¹ That is the Nicene Creed, with the addition of the clause about the Holy Ghost, as we now say it, but of course without the Filioque.

² The Greeks count seven of these Canons, but only the first four were really drawn up by the council : Cf. Lauchert, *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien*, p. xxiv.

reason why they gave it, "because it is New Rome." It is for a purely political reason, because of the new civil rank of his town, that the bishop is to have this primacy of honour. But what is involved in his primacy of honour? It seems to mean, first, an honorary precedence like that given by the Council of Nicæa to the Bishop of Jerusalem (p. 26), only a higher one; the Bishop of New Rome is to take precedence even of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, coming next after the Pope of Old Rome. It must also tacitly suppose that he is now no longer under the Metropolitan of Heraclea; the second bishop of the Church could not well submit to a metropolitan. So from this time we find that Heraclea steps down and Constantinople becomes the Metropolis of Thrace. Did the council mean to give to the Emperor's bishop more than this purely honorary precedence and metropolitan rights over Thrace? Probably not, although we find him very soon exercising real jurisdiction outside that province. It was Alexandria that felt herself most attacked by this Canon. For a long time the Church of Egypt would not accept the council in any way. Dioscur of Alexandria (444-451) in his synod in 449 (the Robber Synod of Ephesus) calls the Council of Ephesus (431) the second general council.¹ Theodoret says that he bitterly reproached the Patriarch Flavian of Antioch, who was present at the Council of 381, as a traitor to the rights of both patriarchal sees, his own and Alexandria, for signing its decrees.² Timothy of Alexandria, who was certainly present at the council with his Egyptians, seems to have been away when this 3rd Canon was drawn up, because he afterwards wrote that he knew nothing about it.³ Rome was not of course attacked by the Canon; her first place no one thought of disputing. Still the Popes, too, objected to this new position suddenly given to Constantinople. They disliked so radical an upsetting of the old order in the case of the other Patriarchs, perhaps they already foresaw something of the danger which the ambition of this new see

¹ Mansi vi., 626, 643. So he ignores Constantinople I.

² Ep. 86, ad Flavianum

³ To the Synod of Aquileia (Hergenröther : *Photius*, I, 34). This Timothy must not be confused with the Cat.

would bring. Pope Damasus reigning at the time (366-384) would only confirm the dogmatic decree against Macedonius,¹ not the Canons. St. Gregory the Great (590-604) says : "The Roman Church hitherto neither acknowledges nor receives the Canons and Acts of that Synod (Const. I), she accepts the same Synod in that which it defined against Macedonius."² Boniface I (418-422) complains of the "new usurpation which is contrary to the knowledge of the ancients." "Study the sanctions of the Canons," he says, "you will find which are the second and third sees after Rome. Let the great Churches keep their dignity according to the Canons, that is Alexandria and Antioch" (Ep. ad Rufinum Thessal.).³ St. Leo the Great (440-461) writes to Anatolius of Constantinople : "You boast that certain bishops sixty years ago made a rescript in favour of this your persuasion. No notice of it was ever sent by your predecessors to the Apostolic See" (Ep. 106, ad Anat.).

The Canon was put by Gratian into our Corpus Iuris,⁴ and the Roman correctors added to it the note : "This Canon is one of those that the Apostolic Roman See did not receive at first nor for a long time." So the first step in the advancement of the new patriarchate was by no means received without opposition. Nevertheless its bishops, under the protection of the Emperor, succeeded wonderfully in their career of aggrandizement. St. Gregory of Nazianzum (329-c. 390) had for a time administered the See of Constantinople. But there had been much friction while he was there. His enemies said that he was Bishop of Sasima, in Cappadocia, all the time, and that he could not be bishop of two places at once. So he left Constantinople, and afterwards wrote ironically to the bishops who succeeded him : "You may have a throne and a lordly place then, since you think that the chief thing ; rejoice, exalt yourselves, claim the title of Patriarch ; broad lands shall be subject to you."⁵ The machinations he had seen among the Court prelates had not left a pleasant impression. Nectarius (381-397), who succeeded St. Gregory, already began to assert

¹ That is the Creed.

² Ep. vii. 34. M.P.L. lxxvii. 893.

³ Quoted by Le Quien, *Or. Chris.* i. 18.

⁴ Dist. xxii. c. 3.

⁵ Greg. Naz. : *Carm. de Episc.* 797, *seq.*

his lordly place over broad lands. In 394 there was a quarrel between two rival claimants to the See of Bostra in Arabia, NE. of Jerusalem. Nectarius settled in favour of one claimant, in defiance of the rights of Antioch, in whose patriarchate Bostra lay. After Nectarius came St. John Chrysostom (397-407). It is with great regret that one remembers the fact that the most sympathetic of the Greek Fathers also on one occasion used jurisdiction outside his province. He put down a number of bishops in Asia, who had been simoniacally elected, and his judgement was entirely just and right. Only the right person to give sentence was the Exarch of Ephesus. Under Atticus, his second successor († 425), began the dispute about Illyricum. The whole of the Roman Prefecture of Illyricum (p. 22) belonged to the Western Patriarchate. Atticus got the Emperor Theodosius II (408-450) to publish a law cutting off East Illyricum from the rest and joining it to his jurisdiction (421).¹ But this first time the plan did not succeed. Illyricum became afterwards a very fruitful source of dispute between Rome and Constantinople. We shall come back to it later (p. 44). The same Theodosius forbade any bishops to be ordained in Thrace *or Asia* without the consent of the Patriarchate at Constantinople. This means jurisdiction over Asia. There was some opposition to the law, but from this time Constantinople gradually absorbs first Asia, then Pontus, and then the whole of what we now call Asia Minor. The Exarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea, who, as we said (p. 25), under other circumstances might have evolved into great Patriarchs, were too poor, too weak, and too near the capital, to offer any effectual resistance. They now sink back to the position of ordinary metropolitans, and we must already reckon Thrace and Asia Minor as making up the Patriarchate of Constantinople, while both the Patriarch and the Emperor have designs on Illyricum. Things were in this state at the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), whose 28th Canon was the most important step of all this development. The time was ripe for a bold stroke. The rivals of Constantinople were too weakened to be able to resist. Dioscur of Alexandria

¹ L. 45, Cod. Theod.

appeared at the council as a culprit, and was deposed by the Papal Legate (p. 14). Maximus of Antioch was himself suspect of Monophysism ; moreover, he had been intruded into his see by the Patriarch of Constantinople, in defiance of the right of election of the Syrian bishops,¹ so that he was only a creature of Anatolius, and was not likely to turn against his patron. Juvenal of Jerusalem had disgraced himself at the Robber Synod (449), and was now deposed in the second session. Then he dropped Dioscur and his former Monophysite friends, and was glad to get his own little patriarchate acknowledged in return (p. 27). But he was not strong enough to dispute the claims of the Emperor's bishop. So Anatolius, then Patriarch of Constantinople (449-458), need fear no rival in the East. At the council he sat next after the Pope's Legates, because the three other Patriarchs were in trouble, and he thought the time had come to get the place he held more or less by accident² acknowledged as a right. Then the council was full of his friends. There were 630 Eastern bishops present ; from the West came only the five legates and two African bishops. But before we come to the Canons in favour of Constantinople we must remember that, in spite of Anatolius's ambition and the almost exclusive presence of Eastern bishops, no ancient council so clearly acknowledges the primacy of the Pope as Chalcedon. The six Imperial Commissioners looked after the secular business, but were expressly shut out from the sessions. The five legates sent by St. Leo (Lucentius, Basil, Paschasius of Lilybæum, Boniface, and Julian of Cos) presided, Paschasius pronounced sentence on Dioscur in the Pope's name (p. 14), the Emperor (Marcian, 450-457) had summoned the council "guarding the rights and the honour of the See of blessed Peter the Apostle" ;³ St. Leo had sent "my aforesaid brother and co-bishop (Paschasius) to preside over the synod

¹ Pope Leo I only acknowledged him for the sake of peace. Ep. 104, ad Marc. c. 5 : "He (Anatolius) has presumed to ordain a bishop for the Church of Antioch without any precedent and against the Canons ; and We have ceased to protest for the sake of the faith and of peace."

² The 3rd Canon of Constantinople I, which gave him the second place, after the Pope, had not been received by the universal Church.

³ Leonis M. ep. 93, ad Syn. Chalc. I.

in my place" ;¹ the synod received the Pope's dogmatic letter to Flavian of Constantinople (447-449) as all the Fathers cried out : "That is the faith of the Fathers, that is the faith of the Apostles . . . Peter has spoken by Leo !" ² They finally wrote to Leo formally asking him to confirm their decrees, because "the enemy (Dioscur) like a beast roaring to himself outside the fold . . . has stretched his madness even towards you, to whom the care of the vineyard was given by the Saviour, that is, as we say, against your Holiness ; and has conceived an excommunication against you, who hasten to unite the body of the Church." ³ There is no doubt, then, as to the sentiments of this synod with regard to the Roman Primacy. Yet these same bishops are specially anxious to exalt the See of Constantinople, not of course to the level of Rome, but above all other Churches. It was in this spirit that they drew up the Canons that became so fruitful a source of dispute. The sixth session (October 25th) was intended to be the last, Marcian and his wife Pulcheria attended it, and the Emperor made an admirable speech ; the decree of the council about our Lord's two natures⁴ was read out, the Emperor forbade any further discussion on the subject by any one.

Then Marcian thought he would like the Fathers to make some laws about discipline. So they held nine more sessions. At the fifteenth session (31st October) the Papal Legates were not present. In their absence the bishops drew up twenty-eight Canons, of which several were made to exalt Constantinople. The 9th and 17th Canons decree, that if any bishop or other clerk have a complaint against his metropolitan, he should bring the case before his Exarch, *or to the Patriarch of Constantinople*. As Exarchs they mean apparently to include the other Eastern Patriarchs. So Constantinople is now to have a sort of jurisdiction even over Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.⁵ But the 28th Canon is the most important one. It says : "Always

¹ Ep. 89, ad Marc.

² Mansi, vi. 972, &c.

³ Ep. Syn. ad Leonem, inter ep. Leonis 98.

⁴ In Denzinger (1900, p. 34).

⁵ That is a voluntary jurisdiction at the discretion of the appellant, who may now choose between his own Exarch and the Patriarch of Constantinople.

following the rules of the holy Father and knowing the Canon of the 150 most God-beloved bishops which has just been read,¹ we also define and vote the same things concerning the Primacy of the most holy Church of Constantinople, the New Rome. And, indeed, the Fathers wisely gave the Primacy to the See of the Elder Rome, because that city was the ruler, and the 150 most God-beloved bishops, moved by the same purpose, appointed a like Primacy to the most holy See of New Rome, rightly judging that the city honoured because of her rule and her Senate, should enjoy a like primacy to that of the elder Imperial Rome, and should be mighty in Church affairs, just as she is, and should be the second after her. Thus the single metropolitans of the dioceses of Asia and Thrace, as also the bishops of the aforesaid dioceses that are among the barbarians, shall be ordained by the said most holy See of the most holy Church at Constantinople, whereas of course each metropolitan in the said dioceses shall ordain the bishops of his province in union with the (other) bishops of the same province, as the holy Canons ordain. But the metropolitans of these dioceses shall be ordained by the Archbishop of Constantinople, as has been said, after they have been elected unanimously and after the election has been reported to him, according to custom."²

[That is the famous 28th Canon of Chalcedon. The second half (to begin with what is less important to us here) means that all metropolitans in Asia and Thrace are to go up to Constantinople to be ordained (this of course puts them under that Patriarch's jurisdiction), so also those bishops whose sees are overrun with barbarians (that is especially in Northern Thrace, towards the Danube, where the Slavs were pouring in). But, where there are no barbarians, the ordinary bishops are to be ordained by the local metropolitans. The Canon then repeats that these metropolitans must be themselves ordained by the Archbishop (*Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, the word is rare in

¹ These 150 most God-beloved bishops are the Fathers of Constantinople I 381), and the Canon that had just been read is their 3rd Canon (p. 32).

² The text will be found in any collection of Canons. I translate from Lauchert, *Die kanones der wichtigsten altkirchl. Concilien*.

the East at this time)¹ of Constantinople, although they must first be properly elected (by their suffragans).

This, then, entirely does away with any remains of exarchal power at Heraclea or Ephesus (they must have meant Cæsarea too). But it was the former half of the Canon that most displeased the Pope. First, they wish to renew the 3rd Canon of Constantinople (381), which Rome had never acknowledged. Secondly, they make the entirely false statement the "Fathers" had given the Primacy to Old Rome because of her political position. Where had these bishops ever seen a Canon giving the Primacy to Old Rome? That Primacy was given, not by the "Fathers" but by our Lord Jesus Christ to St. Peter, "who always lives and judges in his successors" (the legates at Ephesus, 431, p. 76), nor had the political importance of the city of Rome anything to do with an authority given at Cæsarea Philippi to a Galilæan fisherman. Thirdly, the Fathers of Chalcedon, on the strength of this false assumption, wish to confirm an ecclesiastical authority in the case of Constantinople because of her position as head of the State—an incorrect and dangerous position, that would, if consistently carried out, expose the Church's hierarchy to a share in every political revolution.² They do not, however, think of making New Rome quite as great as Old Rome; New Rome is to be "the second after her."³ The sees they really wish to supplant are rather Alexandria and Antioch, and their idea seems to be to divide the whole Church into two great patriarchates, a Western one under Rome, and an Eastern one under Constantinople. But the Pope, whose honour consists in the firm position of his fellow-bishops,⁴ could not

¹ It has since become the official title of the Bishop of Constantinople, see p. 340.

² Throughout this story one cannot help realizing that since 1453 the very basis on which the Patriarchs of Constantinople openly founded their claims has been cut away.

³ Still a certain animus against Old Rome shows in the contrast between their frigid reference to "the See of the Elder Rome" and the rapturous "most holy See of the most holy Church of Constantinople."

⁴ St. Gregory I to Eulogius of Alexandria: "My honour is the honour of the universal Church. My honour is the firm position (*solidus vigor*) of my brothers. I am really honoured when due honour is not denied to each of them" (viii. Ep. 30. M.P.L. lxxvii. 933).

allow the other Patriarchs to be cavalierly deposed for the sake of so new an arrangement, and the reference to his own see was quite enough reason for rejecting this Canon. So it was never received into our Canon Law, and the Popes never ceased to protest against it. On November 1, 451, the Legates summoned a new session to examine what had been done in their absence. Lucentius protested against the 28th Canon as contradicting the Decree of Nicæa (Canon 6, p. 9). There was a debate in which Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, the spokesman of the Greeks, kept appealing to Canon 3 of Constantinople, and Lucentius to Canon 6 of Nicæa. The Illyrian bishops, Eusebius of Ancyra, Metropolitan of Galatia, and others, had already refused to sign this 28th Canon.¹ Nothing came of the dispute, except that the Legates' protest was added to the Acts. In the exceptionally respectful letter of the council to Pope Leo, the Fathers still hope that he will confirm their Canon. They have only confirmed (they say) the rule of the 150 holy Fathers, who ordered that "after your most holy and apostolic See that of Constantinople should be honoured, because she is placed second"; they are "confident that you often spread out the Apostolic ray that shines in you even to the Church of Constantinople, and without envy you are accustomed to enrich your domestics with a share in your own good things. Be pleased then to accept what we have defined, to order ecclesiastical ranks and to remove all confusion, as being right and friendly and most convenient for good order, oh, most holy and blessed Father! But the most holy bishops Paschasius and Lucentius, and the most reverend priest Boniface, who hold the place of your Holiness, have vehemently tried to withstand what we had ordered, doubtless wishing that this good arrangement should be begun by your own foresight. Whereas we, considering the most pious and Christ-loving Emperors, who are delighted with what we have done, as also the illustrious Senate and indeed the whole Imperial city, have thought it wise to confirm its honour by a general council, and we have presumed to strengthen what was really, as it were, begun by your Holiness, inasmuch as you

are always anxious to benefit us, and we know that whatever is well done by the sons belongs to the fathers, who look upon it as their own. We beg you then to honour our decision with your decrees, so that just as we shall then add the consent of the Head, so your Highness may fulfil what your sons have done, as is right. So always will the pious Princes be pleased, who confirm as a law the decision of your Holiness.”¹ The urbanity of this letter is caused by the great wish of the council to have its Canon confirmed ; incidentally, one could not wish for a more complete acknowledgement on the part of a general council that its decrees need the Pope’s confirmation. But it was all of no use. St. Leo did not mean to allow what they wanted, and he was not a person to be persuaded by compliments. He writes to the Emperor Marcian that “the same faith must be that of the people, of bishops, and also of kings, oh, most glorious son and most clement Augustus !” “Let the city of Constantinople, as we wish, have its glory ; and under the protection of the right hand of God may it long enjoy the government of your Clemency. But there is one law for civil affairs and another for divine things ; and no building can be firm apart from that Rock which the Lord founded originally. He who seeks undue honours loses his real ones. Let it be enough for the said bishop (Anatolius of Constantinople), that by the help of your piety and by the consent of my favour, he has got the bishopric of so great a city. Let him not despise a royal see because he can never make it an Apostolic one ; nor should he by any means hope to become greater by offending others. The rights of the Churches are fixed by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and by the decrees of the venerable Nicene Synod ; they cannot be upset by any bad designs, nor disturbed by any novelty. And I, by the help of Christ, must always faithfully carry out this order, because the responsibility has been given to me, and it would be my fault if the rules of the Fathers, drawn up by the Synod of Nicæa under the guidance of the Holy Ghost for the whole Church, were broken with my consent—which may God forbid !—or if the wish of one brother were more important to me than the common good

¹ Ep. Conc. Chal. ad Leonem (inter ep. Leonis M. 98).

of the whole house of God. Wherefore, knowing how your glorious Clemency cares for concord in the Church and for the things that belong to peaceful union, I beg and urgently entreat you to refuse your consent to impious attempts contrary to Christian peace, and to wholesomely restrain the dangerous ambition of my brother Anatolius, if he persists." ¹ At the same time St. Leo writes to Anatolius himself. He praises his orthodoxy with regard to the Monophysite heresy. "But," he says, "a Catholic man, and especially a priest of the Lord, should not be corrupted by ambition any more than involved in error." He blames the uncanonical ordination of Maximus of Antioch (p. 36), insists on the 6th Nicene Canon, and adds: "The rights of provincial primates may not be injured, nor may metropolitan bishops be defrauded of their ancient privileges. The dignity that the Alexandrine See deserves because of St. Mark, the disciple of blessed Peter, must not perish; nor may the splendour of so great a Church be darkened because Dioscur falls through his obstinate wickedness. And the Antiochene Church, too, in which, by the preaching of the blessed Peter the Christian name first arose, should remain in the order arranged by the Fathers, so that having been put in the third place it should never be reduced to a lower one." ² He wrote in the same sense to the Empress Pulcheria, ³ and all through his life steadily refused to acknowledge this 28th Canon. The result of the Pope's refusal was that the Canon was never inserted into any code of Canon Law, either Eastern or Western, till the Greeks revived it at the time of Photius's schism. It has never been the law of the Catholic Church.

Nevertheless from the end of the 5th century the See of Constantinople does gradually assume the second place after Rome. Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem went down in importance, as we have seen. The Emperors, indeed, deposed their own bishops and appointed new ones from laymen wantonly; the Patriarch was, after all, only a vassal of Cæsar, to whom he owed the place of his see. But the same Emperors

¹ Ep. 104, ad Marcianum Augustum.

² Ep. 106, ad Anatolium, 5.

³ Ep. 105.

were always ready to assert his place above other bishops. Zeno (474-491) was a powerful patron, Leo I (the Emperor, 457-474) had let the Patriarch crown him, and this custom, always followed afterwards, also helped to raise the dignity of the see. Justinian (527-565) put into his Code of Civil Law : "The most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, shall have the second place after the holy Apostolic See of Old Rome ; he shall precede all others."¹ At last John IV, the Faster (*Νηστευτής*, Jejunator, 582-595), of Constantinople, thought he could assume the title "Œcumenical Patriarch." It is well known how St. Gregory the Great (590-604) sternly forbade him to use this name, which is not even used by the Pope.² "Who doubts," he says, "that the Church of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolic See? Indeed the most pious Lord Emperor and our brother the bishop of that city both eagerly acknowledge this."³ Again : "I know of no bishop who is not subject to the Apostolic See."⁴ It is also known how in opposition to this pompous title he assumed for himself with proud humility the title borne ever since by his successors, "Servant of the Servants of God."⁵ Although the Patriarchs of Constantinople, encouraged again by the Emperors, went on using their sounding title till it became, as it still is, their official style, it is noticeable that even Photius never dared call himself Œcumenical Patriarch when writing to the Pope.

Rome, however, did gradually acknowledge Constantinople,

¹ Nov. 131, c. 2.

² Ep. Greg. Magni, v. 18 (M.P.L. lxxvii. 738), &c.

³ Ibid., ix. 12 (M.P.L. lxxvii. 957).

⁴ Mansi, x. 155.

⁵ Joh. Diac. Vita S. Greg. II, i. M.P.L. lxxv. 87. It is not certain what John the Faster meant by the title "Œcumenical Patriarch" (there are instances of its use before his time), perhaps only "Imperial Patriarch." St. Gregory certainly understood it to mean that he claimed to be the only real Patriarch for the whole world, so that all other bishops should be his suffragans or vicars : "If one Patriarch is called universal, the name is taken away from the others" (Ep. v. 18, M.P.L. lxxvii. 740). In this sense he says that no one (not even himself) can be so called. Such has always been the teaching of the Catholic Church. All bishops who are ordinaries have "ordinary" and not "delegate" jurisdiction in their own diocese. The Pope is not Œcumenical Patriarch, and has never called himself so, although in addresses to him the title "universal Pope" has sometimes been used ; he is Patriarch of the West. For the whole question see Hergenröther, *Photius*, I, 184-196 ; Kattenbusch : *Konfessionskunde*, I, 112-117.

first, as one of the patriarchates, and eventually even as the second. This same St. Gregory formally announced his election to the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, although in his private correspondence he still cherishes the older system of three patriarchates only (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch). The second place was given to the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople¹ by Innocent III (1198-1216) at the fourth Lateran Council in 1215. In 1439 the Council of Florence gave the same rank to the Greek Patriarch.²

The territory over which they ruled went on growing after the "Œcumenical Patriarchs" had become the chief bishops of Eastern Christendom. Leo III, the Isaurian (Emperor, 717-741), separated his own fatherland Isauria (at the south of Asia Minor), with the Metropolis at Seleucia and twenty suffragan sees, from the Patriarchate of Antioch and gave it to Constantinople. But the greatest question of this kind was *Illyricum*. We have seen that the Roman Prefecture of Illyricum,³ together with Italy and Gaul, went to make up the great Western Patriarchate. But the Illyrians, at least the "Roman" inhabitants, spoke Greek. Illyricum covered Athens and Corinth, so the Patriarchs of Constantinople, who had become the chiefs of Greek-speaking Christians, greatly desired these lands. The Emperors were always ready to add to their jurisdiction; the more people looked to Constantinople in all affairs for guidance, the closer their interests were knit to the capital, the better, of course, for the central government. At the sixth general council (Constantinople III or Trullanum I in 680) and at the Quinisextum (Trullanum II in 692) the Illyrian bishops are still counted among those of the Roman

¹ A Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople was set up by the Crusaders together with their Latin Empire in 1204.

² Rome has often accepted a *fait accompli*, as long as it does not injure faith or morals, even if it began by an injustice against which she had protested. She eventually acknowledged Napoleon Buonaparte and the Protestant succession in England.

³ Illyricum is, in modern language, Bosnia, Serbia, Western Turkey, Greece and Crete. At the time we speak of, the original population was Greek, with continual inroads of barbarians—Goths and then Slavs of various kinds. The Bulgars came in the 10th century.

Patriarchate. In 649 Pope Martin I (649-655) suspends the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and says in his letter that this Church is "subject to Our Apostolic See," meaning clearly to his patriarchate. St. Gregory the Great (590-604) has left among his letters no less than twenty-one written about the affairs of Illyricum, and he sends the Pallium to the Illyrian Metropolitans. Now it should be noticed that, whereas in the East patriarchal jurisdiction is expressed by the right of ordaining, in the West the corresponding symbol is the sending of a Pallium. The Popes have never made a point of ordaining all their archbishops; on the other hand, they did not send Pallia to Eastern Metropolitans. In 545 Justinian put into his Authenticum a law about the Bishop of Nea Iustiniane (see p. 49); he is to have jurisdiction over a great part of Illyricum, but only as "holding the place (τὸν τόπον ἐπέχειν=representative) of the Apostolic See of Rome."¹ And yet, inconsistently, the Codex contains a law of Theodosius II (408-450) placing Illyricum under Constantinople, and of course with the everlasting explanation "because that city rejoices in the privileges of Old Rome"; and on the strength of this law the Œcumenical Patriarchs continually put forth a claim to Illyricum.

One must say that the question was never agreed upon till the great schism. Old Rome had on her side antiquity (she had ruled over Illyricum before any one had ever heard of a patriarchate at Constantinople), custom and the sentiment of the Illyrian bishops themselves, New Rome appealed to a Civil Law made by her Emperor. At the time of the schism this question was one of the chief ones (p. 152); since then there has been unhappily no possibility of settling it. The Illyrian Christian is now, of course, either Catholic or Orthodox, and so obeys either the Latin Vicar Apostolic or the Orthodox Metropolitan.² A like case was that of *Magna Græcia*, the old greater Greece, that is, Sicily and the south of Italy (Calabria, Apulia, &c.). The people here were nearly all Greeks by blood and language. Politically, these lands belonged to the Eastern Roman Empire

¹ Nov. 131.

² See Duchesne, "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique," in his *Églises séparées* pp. 229-279.

from the time Justinian's army conquered Italy from the Goths (554) till the Normans gradually took them (1060-1138). As the people were mostly Greeks, the Greek rite (of Byzantium) was used generally, and they had Greek monasteries. But some bishops (for instance, the Bishop of Trani to whom Leo of Achrida writes in 1053, p. 178) were Latins. In any case all Italy and Sicily belonged to the Roman Patriarchate even more plainly than Illyricum, and had so belonged for centuries before there was such a person as a Patriarch of Constantinople. But at last the Emperor thought he could cement the allegiance of these distant provinces to his own throne by joining them to the Byzantine Patriarchate. Leo III (the Isaurian, 717-741) made a civil law proclaiming this; and from that time the Byzantine bishops make fitful attempts to assert jurisdiction here too, as long as the land belongs to the Empire. But the Normans conquer Sicily from 1060 to 1091, and then gradually seize the mainland too, forming what was afterwards called the kingdom of the two Sicilies. The last Imperial city to fall was Naples in 1138. From this time no one any longer disputes the Roman Patriarch's jurisdiction in these parts, though the Byzantine rite lingered on and is even still used about here. Magna Græcia is an exception to the general rule that rite follows patriarchate.

This completes our account of the rise and evolution of Constantinople, the "Great Church."¹ So we have reached the classical number of five patriarchates, in this order: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, that afterwards seemed, to Eastern theologians especially, as obvious and necessary in the Christian Church as the five senses to a man's body.² We have now only to trace the rise of the one

¹ Ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία has become its official title.

² C. 1054 Dominic, Patriarch of Venice, wrote to Peter, Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, asking him, among other things, to recognize Venice as a patriarchate, also founded by St. Peter through St. Mark, and mentioning that he (Dominic) sits at the Pope's right hand. In Peter's answer he says: "Your honoured letter says that the most holy Church over which you preside was founded by the chief Apostle Peter and given to the Evangelist Mark, and that you sit at the right hand of the blessed Pope, and that therefore I should receive your letter as that of a Patriarch. But indeed, most sacred spiritual brother, my modesty received your letter with honour as if it had

independent Church province in the Orthodox East, that eventually belonged to none of them.

6. Cyprus.

The island of Cyprus at first undoubtedly obeyed Antioch.¹ The Gospel had been brought to the island by St. Paul and St. Barnabas on their first missionary journey. St. Barnabas was counted the first Bishop of Cyprus, his successor at Constantia (the old Salamis) was Metropolitan over three other Cypriote bishops. He went up to Antioch to be ordained just like the other metropolitans of the patriarchate. It was possibly the confusion of the Arian troubles, when heretics reigned even at Antioch, that first made the Metropolitan of Constantia think he would like to be independent and have an "autocephalous" province to himself. From the beginning of the 5th century, at any rate, the Cypriote bishops begin to assert their independence. Pope Innocent I (401-417) stood out for the rights of Antioch.² The Council of Ephesus (431) was already ill-disposed towards that see (its occupier John³ was the chief supporter of Nestorius). The Bishops of Cyprus assured the Fathers of the council that their Metropolitan had always

come, not only from a Patriarch, but from a mighty Pontiff of God equal to the Apostles. On the other hand, whereas from my earliest years till old age I have been taught holy letters (theology) and have always carefully studied them, never from any one did I anywhere hear or learn till to-day that there is a Patriarch of Venice. For there are in all the world by God's grace only five Patriarchs, the Roman, Constantinopolitan, Alexandrine, Antiochene and Hierosolymitan." Peter goes on to say that the Roman and Alexandrine Bishops should be called Pope, those of Constantinople and Jerusalem Archbishop; so that he himself is the only quite real Patriarch. Then: "Now listen to what I say. A man's body is ruled by one head, in it are many members, which are all guided by only five senses, so also the body of Christ," &c. The comparison is a favourite one. George of Trebizond, at about the same time, tells us which each one is. Rome is touch, Constantinople taste, Alexandria sight, Antioch hearing, and Jerusalem smell. His reasons, and the correspondence between Dominic of Venice and Peter of Antioch may be seen in Will: *Acta et Scripta de Controv. Eccl. Græcæ et Latinæ*.

¹ Cyprus was part of the Roman civil diocese of the East, that became the Antiochene Patriarchate.

² His letter in Jaffe's Reg. Rom. Pont. 310.

³ 428-441.

been ordained by his own suffragans, never at Antioch ;¹ and so the council in its seventh session acknowledged the independence of their Church, though only in as far as such was already an ancient custom.² There seems to have been a feeling that an Apostolic Church should be not submitted to, but be the equal of the Patriarchal Sees ; although this idea was never consistently carried out, nor applied to the numberless Pauline Churches. St. Barnabas was an Apostle, although not one of the twelve, and it was he who secured for his Church of Cyprus its exceptional position. In spite of the Council of Ephesus the See of Antioch was unwilling to let Cyprus go. In 488, Peter the Dyer (Γναφεύς, Fullo, Patriarch from 470-488)³ made a great effort to assert his jurisdiction over the island. But Anthimus, Metropolitan of Constantia, who was resisting him, just at the right time in the middle of the dispute received a revelation telling him where St. Barnabas's grave was, quite near his own city. This seemed to enforce the Apostolicity of his see—it was not only founded by an Apostle, but it still possessed his relics. So from that time the independent ("autocephalous" is the technical word) character of the Metropolitan, or rather Exarch of Constantia and Cyprus was no more called into question.⁴

The Island Church had one more interesting adventure, that has left its trace till to-day. In 647 Cyprus was ravaged by the Saracens ; in 686 a treaty between the Emperor and the Khalifah settled that half its tribute should be paid to Constantinople and half to Damascus. Then Justinian II (685-695) thought he could manage to keep the whole of the tribute by shipping the population of the island to the mainland, out of the Khalifah's reach. So they all had to go to the

¹ This may have been true, for some time at any rate

² Hardouin, i. 1620. Hefele, ii. 208.

³ He was a Monophysite, twice deposed and restored, who added to the Trisagion (Sanctus) the words, "Who was crucified for us." These words were thought to contain Monophysite venom and were, after much dispute, rejected by the Orthodox. They are still a speciality of the Jacobite liturgy.

⁴ It was again confirmed by the Trullanum II (the Quinisextum in 692), Canon 39.

corner of Asia Minor, near the Hellespont ; and there he built them a city which he called *Nea Iustinianupolis*—the New City of Justinian.¹ Their bishops came too ; the Exarch of Cyprus sat at *Nea Iustinianupolis*, and the 39th Canon of the *Quinisextum* (692) transfers all the rights, privileges and independence of the See of Constantia to the new city ; moreover, the Exarch now was given jurisdiction over the Metropolitan of Cyzicus and all the bishops of the Hellespont, to make up for his lost island. But it all came to nothing. Only one Exarch (John) reigned at *Nea Iustinianupolis*, then Justinian II died, and the Cypriotes went home again, taking their hierarchy with them. The Hellespont fell back into the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the only relic of Justinian's arrangement is that the Exarchs of Cyprus have added the purely honorary title of Archbishop of *Nea Iustiniane* to their names.

If, then, we make a survey of the Eastern Churches at any time from the 5th to the 9th centuries, we shall find, first of all, that already a very large number of Christians have left the union of the Catholic Church. Egypt is full of Monophysite Copts, Syria of Jacobites ; Armenia has fallen off, the Nestorians have all escaped to Persia. On the other hand, we find established throughout the Empire one great corporate body, far greater than all the schismatical Churches put together, which, in spite of such nicknames as Melkite, Dyophysite, and so on, is always officially known as the Orthodox Catholic Church. Throughout this Catholic Church the Pope reigns as Over-Lord and Chief (we shall see this in the next chapter) ; it is divided into the five patriarchates and the autocephalous Church of Cyprus.

Except for the schism between the East and West, this remained the fundamental constitution of Eastern Christendom until the rise of independent national Churches almost in our own time. And our Canon Law still contains the 21st Canon of the eighth general council (Constantinople IV, in 869) : " We define that no one at all of the mighty ones of this world shall dishonour those who occupy the patriarchal

¹ The name was shortened into *Nea Iustiniane*.

thrones, or shall try to move them from their sees, especially the most holy Pope of Old Rome, and then the Patriarch of Constantinople, and those of Alexandria, and Antioch and Jerusalem.”¹

Summary.

We have seen then, that already in the first ages some bishops had authority over others; metropolitans ruled over bishops, exarchs over metropolitans, the first three sees were those of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch. This was already an “ancient custom” at the time of the first general council. That council (Nicæa I, 325) acknowledges it and gives an honorary rank to Jerusalem. The second general council (Constantinople I, 381) wants to give the second rank to Constantinople, “because it is New Rome,” but the Canon is not accepted by the Pope. The third council (Ephesus, 431) makes Cyprus autocephalous. The fourth (Chalcedon, 451) changes the honorary rank of Jerusalem into a real patriarchate and enormously extends the power of Constantinople; but its Canon is again rejected by the Pope. Meanwhile two other sees, Ephesus and Cæsarea in Cappadocia, have their careers cut short by Constantinople. The Nestorian heresy produces a schism in the extreme east of the Empire, and then a national Church in Persia. Monophysism causes permanent schismatical national Churches in Egypt and Syria, and cuts off all Armenia. Islam overruns Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, completing the fall of their three patriarchates. Constantinople is left without a rival in the East, becomes the head of all the Eastern Churches, and already is very jealous of Rome. But the Canon Law both of East and West always recognizes the five patriarchates and Cyprus.

CHAPTER II

ROME AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES

THE relation of the Eastern bishops to the West means practically their relation to the Pope at Rome. With other Western bishops they had little to do ; a Latin bishop was to them just a suffragan¹ of the Roman Patriarch who, if ever he did appear at a Council, would be sure to vote with his chief.

All the more important was their relation to the Pope himself. It was not always a friendly one. During the second half of these eight centuries especially, there was plenty of friction ; mistakes were made by both sides, jealousies and discontent were fostered, till they became a sort of national cause, and so prepared the disaster which came in the 9th century. Nevertheless, during this period the Eastern Churches acknowledged the Primacy of the Pope, and when at last the schism came, it was they who made the change by rejecting it, not the Latins who went on maintaining it.

A chain of texts from various writers, drawn up to prove a thesis, is never very interesting to read. Moreover, the texts I have to produce now have been quoted already a number of times. They form part of the argument for the Papacy in the first centuries, a subject about which it seems that everything on either side has already been said. Nevertheless, the question is

¹ Suffragan is not really the right word. Metropolitans have suffragans. There is no technical name to express the relation of a bishop to his patriarch. In any case, one should never call an auxiliary bishop a suffragan.

to Catholics by far the most important of all concerning the Eastern Churches, and it is especially necessary as balancing what we have to consider in the last paragraph. We will only take the Eastern (chiefly Greek) writers, or cases that concern their Church into account, leaving out altogether all the Latin Fathers and Western Councils, as well as the very earliest writers (Apostolic Fathers and Apologists), in whose time one can hardly yet speak of an Eastern and a Western Church. Our Catena is then only a fragment; the historic argument for the Roman Primacy must be studied in one of the books written on that subject. It will be convenient *first* to see what the great Eastern Fathers and then the later Byzantine theologians say about the Papacy; *secondly*, to notice some cases in which we find the Primacy working; *thirdly*, to examine the relations between Popes and the councils that both Catholics and Orthodox accept as œcumenical; and, *fourthly*, to consider the other side of the question, the causes of ill-feeling between the Churches that prepared the schism.

I. The Eastern Fathers and the Papacy.

The great school of Greek and Syrian Fathers begins with the time of *Constantine* (Eusebius of Cæsarea, † c. 340), and lasts till about that of *Marcian* (450–457) and the Monophysite heresy—just over a century.

These Fathers in the first place believed that St. Peter was the *Prince of the Apostles*, and the Rock on which our Lord built his Church. They not only saw it in their New Testament, they had received the tradition from their forbears. Long ago *Origen* († 254) had written: "See what is said by the Lord to that great fundament and most solid rock on which Christ built his Church: Oh, thou of little faith, he says, why hast thou doubted?"¹ *Eusebius*, the Father of Church History († c. 340), writes, quoting *Origen*: "Peter on whom the Church of Christ is built up (οἰκοδομεῖται) left one Epistle generally received."² *St. Basil* († 379): "When we say Peter we mean the son of Jonas, brother of Andrew, who since he was the greatest in faith

¹ Hom. 5 in Exod. 4. M.P.G. xii, 329.

² H.E. vi. 25.

received the building up of the Church to himself.”¹ *St. Ephrem* († 373) represents our Lord as saying to *St. Peter*: “Simon, my disciple, I have made you the foundation of the holy Church. I have called you a Rock because you shall hold up all my building. You are the inspector² of those who build my Church on earth ; if they want to build anything badly you as the foundation shall restrain them, you are the Head of the fountain of my teaching. . . . Behold, I have made you lord over all my treasures.”³ *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* († 386) calls him : “Peter, Prince of the Apostles and Supreme Herald of the Church,” “Key-bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven.” *St. John Chrysostom* († 407) seems to never mention *St. Peter* without adding the strongest expressions of his dignity. No one of the Fathers, either Greek or Latin, so constantly refers to the Primacy of *St. Peter*, or gives him such splendid titles, as *St. Chrysostom*. *St. Peter* is the chief (*κορυφαῖος*) of the Apostles,⁴ the first Apostle, head of their company,⁵ first in the Church, the unbreakable Rock and immovable basement, &c.⁶ He is the column of the Church, firmament of faith, fundament of the confession, fisherman of the whole world,⁷ head of the brotherhood, president of all the world, foundation of the Church.⁸ But it is needless to multiply examples of what no one who at all knows *St. John Chrysostom* will deny. Let any one open a volume of his sermons by chance and look for the first mention of *St. Peter* ; he will almost certainly find such titles as these after it. *St. Gregory of Nazianzum* († c. 390),⁹ *St. Gregory of Nyssa* († c. 395),¹⁰ *St. Epiphanius* († 403),¹¹ *St. Cyril of Alexandria* († 444),¹² all have the same thing to say : *St. Peter* was Prince of the Apostles, the foundation on which our Lord built his Church, and the Shepherd of the whole flock. To this day

¹ Adv. Eunom. M.P.G. xxix. 579.

² *Bochūra* (*Bachr*, to examine). This is the word he uses for bishop, otherwise they can only say “*Efisqaufa*.”

³ Sermo de pass. et resur. 4, 1 ; Lamy, i. 412.

⁴ De Sac. II. 1. M.P.G. xlviii. 631.

⁵ Hom. 88 in Joh. i. p. 478.

⁶ De Poen. hom. iii. 4, 298.

⁷ De 10,000 tal. deb. 3, 20.

⁸ Hom. in Hoc scitote, 275.

⁹ Or. 32, de mod. in disp. 18, p. 194.

¹⁰ Laud. II. S. Steph. p. 734 ; De Castig. p. 311.

¹¹ Hæres. 59, p. 1030.

¹² In Mt. 16, 18, p. 423.

the Church of Constantinople in her office honours St. Peter as "The foundation of the Church and Rock of the faith,"¹ and "Immovable basis of dogmas," "throne of the faith," "sitting on the first throne of the Apostles."²

These same Fathers knew that St. Peter had been the first *Bishop of Rome*, and that the Pope is his successor. *Eusebius* writes of "the first succession of the Apostles," and says: "Linus received the Bishopric of the Roman Church first after Peter,"³ Pope Victor "was the thirteenth bishop of the Roman Church since Peter."⁴ *Epiphanius*: "the succession of the Roman Bishops is thus: Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clement," &c.⁵ The Fathers of *Chalcedon* cry out, when St. Leo's letter has been read to them: "Peter has spoken by Leo," the Fathers of the *sixth general council* (Constantinople III, in 680) repeat their words: "Peter has been spoken by Agatho."⁶ *Eulogius of Alexandria* († 608) "said of the chair of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, that he himself sits therein to this day in his successors."⁷ On the feast of SS. Peter and Paul the Church of Constantinople still sings: "Let the Protector of Rome, the Steward of the kingdom, Rock of the faith, firm foundation stone of the Catholic Church, be celebrated in sacred hymns."⁸ And on the commemoration of all the Apostles (June 30th) the Menaion contains the hymn: "Summit and foundation of the Apostles, you left all things and followed your Master, saying: May I die with you, so as to live the life of the Blessed. You became the first Bishop of Rome; you were the glory and honour of the greatest of all cities and fulcrum of the Church, oh Peter, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail."⁹

From these premisses the Eastern Church drew the same conclusion as the Latins. The foundation stone must last as long as the building that rests on it, and therefore it could not

¹ Menaion, Jan. 16th (St. Peter's Chains) in the Hesperinon.

² Cf. Nilles: *Kalendarium manuale*, i. 72, 193, 194. For further examples see *Echos d'Orient*, i. 307-309: *Les titres glorieux de l'Apôtre Saint Pierre dans l'hymnographie grecque*.

³ H.E. iii. 4. ⁴ Ibid. v. 28. ⁵ Hær. 27, n. 6. ⁶ Hardouin, iii. 1422.

⁷ So St. Gregory the Great, L. 7, Ep. 40, M.P.L. lxxvii. 898.

⁸ Card. Pitra: *Hymnographie de l'Eglise grecque*, Rome, 1867, p. cxx.

⁹ Menaion for June (Venice, 1895), Sticharon for June 30th, p. 119.

have died with St. Peter. It must still *exist in his successors*. *St. John Chrysostom* says : "Why did he (our Lord) shed his blood? To redeem the sheep which he handed over to Peter and to his successors." ¹ So St. Peter's successor is the *Chief Bishop*, just as he was the Chief Apostle, and has jurisdiction over all other bishops. Most of the cases in which we see this belief of the Eastern Church are cases of appeals to Rome, to which we shall come later (p. 67). Meanwhile here are some texts, chosen out of a great number. *St. Basil* writes to Pope Damasus, telling him of the troubles of the Eastern Church, and adding : "The only remedy we can see for these evils is a visitation from your Mercy." ² He writes to St. Athanasius : "We thought it expedient to write to the Bishop of Rome that he should examine our affairs, and to advise him, since it would be difficult to send any one (he means a legate) thence by the common decree of a synod, to himself use his lawful authority in the matter (*αὐτὸν ἀθροῖν περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα*), choosing men (legates) fit to bear the fatigue of a journey, and also fit to correct all perverse people in our parts gently and firmly." ³ *Sozomen*, who continued Eusebius's Church History (c. 440-450), says that "the Bishop of the Romans, having examined the accusations against them (St. Athanasius and other Eastern bishops), and having found that they all agreed with the faith of the Nicene Synod, admitted them to communion with himself. And since the care of all belonged to him because of the rank of his see, he restored to each one his Church." ⁴

At the same time a Latin bishop, *St. Peter Chrysologus* (Archbishop of Ravenna, † 450), was asked by Eutyches, Archimandrite of the monastery without the walls of Constantinople and Father of the Monophysite sect, to take his side. Chrysologus answers him : "Honourable brother, I advise you to obediently attend in all things to what has been written by the most blessed Pope of the City of Rome, because St. Peter, who lives and reigns in his own See, teaches the truth of faith to those who seek it." ⁵ So Eutyches got no help from Ravenna.

¹ De Sac. ii. 1. M.P.G. xlviii. 632.

² Ep. 70, ad Dam. M.P.G. xxxii. 434.

³ Ep. 69, ad Athan. I, *ibid.* 432.

⁴ H.E. iii. 8. M.P.G. lxvii. 1052.

⁵ Ep. ad Eutychen, 2.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in Syria († 458), is considered to have been the most learned exegetical writer of the East.¹ He was deposed by the Robber Synod of Ephesus in 449, and promptly appealed to St. Leo I, the reigning Pope. He says to St. Leo : "If Paul, preacher of truth, and trumpet of the Holy Ghost, turns to the great Peter, in order to get his explanation for the benefit of those who doubted about whether to keep the (old) law at Antioch, how much more do we, humble and weak ones, come to your Apostolic See, that we may receive from you the remedy for the Church's wounds. For you must hold the first place in all things."² A *Bishop of Patara* writes to Justinian (527-565) concerning Pope St. Silverius (536-537) whom he, the Emperor, was persecuting : "There are many sovereigns on earth, but not one who is placed over the Church of the whole world, as is the Pope."³ But Justinian begins the Byzantine period, of which hereafter (p. 63). It is strange that the schismatical Eastern Church should still use words that express the Roman Primacy. St. Martin occupied the chair of St. Peter from 649-655. In a synod at the Lateran (649) he rejected two decrees (the Ekthesis of Heraclius and the Typus of Constans II), in which the Emperors had drawn up a compromise between the Catholic faith and the Monothelite heresy. In 653 the Emperor⁴ sent to seize him, had him dragged first to the Island Naxos, then to Constantinople, where he was condemned for high treason and banished to the Chersonese. Here he died from the effects of the most barbarous ill-treatment, torture, and the want even of bread, on September 16, 655 ; and he is honoured as a martyr for the faith by East and West. We keep his feast on November 12th, they on April 13th and September 20th, and they sing in his honour this hymn : "By what name shall I call thee, oh Martin ! Shall I call thee the glorious ruler of the Orthodox Faith for all ? Or the sacred chief of divine dogmas, unstained by error ? . . . Or

¹ Theodoret of Cyrus was for a time suspect of Nestorianism, and his writings were condemned by the fifth general council (it was the second of Justinian's Three Chapters), see pp. 82, 83.

² Ep. 113, ad Leon. M. M.P.G. lxxxiii. 1312, seq.

³ Liberati Breviarium, M.P.L. lxxviii. 22.

⁴ Constans II, 641-668.

the most true reprover of heresy? . . . We know that thou wast the foundation of bishops, pillar of the Orthodox Faith, teacher of religion. . . . Thou didst adorn the divine See of Peter, and since thou from this divine Rock didst guard the Church unmoved, so now with him (St. Peter) art thou glorified." ¹ On St. Gregory the Great's feast they have even more to say about the Roman See: "Most sacred Pastor, thou art the successor of the see and also of the zeal of the first one (τῶν κορυφαίων, St. Peter), cleansing the people and bringing them to God. Successor of the throne of the prince of the choir of disciples, whence thou dost by thy teaching as with a torch enlighten the faithful, oh Gregory! When the first of Churches embraced thee, she watered all the earth that is beneath the sun with divine teaching. Hail, torch of religion, who dost light up all the world with the glory of thy words! lighthouse, who dost call back to the shore those who are tossed among the waves of error! Instrument sounded by the breath of the Holy Ghost!" ² They have a great devotion to St. Gregory Dialogos, as they call him; and both hymns are an example of a very honourable conservatism, that will not alter their venerable office, in spite of later quarrels against the "divine See of Peter," the "first of Churches."

These Greek Fathers, however, not only looked to Rome in cases of Church government; Rome was also the *last Court of Appeal in questions of faith*. When other bishops disagreed about some point of doctrine, when there was no opportunity of summoning a general council (they could not make bishops come together from every part of the Empire to settle each dispute); then they asked what was the teaching of the first of Churches, in which St. Peter, the rock and foundation of all, still lived and taught. *Sozomen* says of the heresy of Macedonius: "When this question was moved, and when the quarrel grew from day to day, the Bishop of the City of Rome having heard of it wrote to the Eastern Churches that they must confess the Trinity, consubstantial, equal in honour and glory, just as the Western bishops do. When he had done

¹ Menaion for April 13th (Venice, 1895), pp. 45-49. Nilles, *Kal.* I, 137, 138.

² Nilles, *o.c.* I, 121.

this all were silent, as the controversy was ended by the decision of the Roman Church, and the question was seen to be at an end." ¹ He refers to St. Damasus's letter in 378, and his words are a Greek parallel to St. Augustine's, "The decrees have come from the Apostolic See, the cause is finished" ²—*Roma locuta est, causa finita est.* *St. Cyril of Alexandria* († 444) writes to accuse Nestorius of heresy to his "Most loving Father Celestine" (Pope, 422–432). "Since God requires us to be watchful in these matters," he says, "and since the ancient custom of the Church persuades us to communicate them to your Holiness, I write, forced by the necessity of the case, and tell you that Satan is now confusing everything and raging against the Church of God." ³ St. Celestine answers him: "Using the authority of our See, in our place (he is making him his Legate) you shall carry out this sentence with due severity, namely, that he (Nestorius) must either write out a profession condemning his wicked assertions within ten days from this meeting (C. of Ephesus), or, if he will not do so, your Holiness shall provide for that Church (Nestorius was Patriarch of Constantinople), and shall know that he is in every way to be removed from our communion." ⁴ *Theodoret* represents our Lord as saying to St. Peter: "As I did not forsake you in the waves, so do you be a support to your brothers in trouble, give to them the same help by which you yourself were saved, do not reject those who stumble, but lift them up when they are falling. For this reason I let you stumble, but do not let you fall, through you I give firmness to those who are tossed about." ⁵ We have seen how Theodoret knows he has to act towards the Pope as the other Apostles towards their Pope, St. Peter (p. 56). At the time of the Three Chapters, Severus Scholasticus at Constantinople writes to *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, Deacon at Carthage and a famous Canonist († c. 546), to ask him whether one may say that Jesus Christ is "one of the holy and undivided Trinity" (it is the old question of the *Communicatio Idiomatum*: may one apply to the man Jesus Christ divine names?). To whom Fulgentius answers: "Most

¹ H.E. vi. 22. M.P.G. lxvii. 1348.

Sermo 131.

³ Ep. 11. M.P.G. l. 447.

⁴ Hardouin, i. 1323.

⁵ *L.c.* Theodoret.

prudent sir, if you want to know the truth, ask in the first place the Bishop of the Apostolic See, whose right judgement stands firm by the judgement of truth, and is strengthened by the weight of his authority.”¹ *Eutychius*, Patriarch of Constantinople (552–582), writes to Pope Vigilius (540–555): “We receive and accept the letters of the Prelates of the Apostolic Roman See, both those of the others and especially those of Leo of holy memory, which were written concerning the true faith and concerning the four holy councils.”² *Sergius of Cyprus* writes to Pope Theodore I (642–649): “Christ our God made your illustrious Apostolic See a firmament fixed by God and immovable, oh sacred Chief! For you are Peter, as the Divine word truly says, and on your foundation the pillars of the Church are fixed. He gave to you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and declared that you have power to bind and loosen what is in heaven or on earth. You are the destroyer of profane heresies, and the Prince and Doctor of the orthodox and immaculate faith. Wherefore, most holy Father, do not despise the fact that the faith of your Fathers is troubled and blown about by certain heretical winds and by them endangered; pierce through the cloud of these foolish persons with the light of your Divine knowledge.”³ *St. Maximus the Confessor*, Archimandrite of the monastery of Chrysopolis by Constantinople, suffered torture and death for the same cause and at the same time as Pope St. Martin (p. 56). He, too, was tried for high treason, was accused, of all amazing charges, of being responsible for the Saracen conquest of Egypt, and was told to give up his obstinate private opinion, and to accept the Emperor’s Typos. To which he answered: “I have no private opinion, but only agree with the Catholic Church.” After having been twice banished, and suffering every conceivable privation, he was scourged through the city, had his tongue cut out, and died of his torture on August 13, 662. He is honoured as a martyr by us and by the Greeks.⁴ This saint, too, has the plainest things to say about the Roman See: “All the ends of the earth, and all who in any place really

¹ Ep. v. n. i. M.P.L. lxvii. 911.

² Ibid. 64.

³ Mansi, x. 914.

⁴ His life in Combefis and M.P.G. xc. 68, seq.

confess the Lord in the true faith, turn their eyes to the most holy Roman Church and to her confession and faith, as to a sun of eternal light. . . . For since the beginning, when the Word of God came down to us, being made man, all the Churches of the Christians have received one only firm basis and foundation, the great Church that is there (at Rome), against which, according to the Saviour's promise, the gates of hell shall never prevail, and which holds the keys of the true faith in him, which gives the true and only piety to those who come to her devoutly, which shuts the mouth of all heretics." ¹ And he writes of Pyrrhus, the Monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople (638-655): "If he wants to neither be considered, nor to really be a heretic, he need not try to please first this one and then that one—to do this would be superfluous and unreasonable, because just as all are scandalized at him because one is scandalized, so if he satisfies this one, without doubt all will be satisfied. So let him hasten above all to satisfy the Roman See. If he agrees with her, every one will in all places call him pious and orthodox. Indeed, he is talking in vain if he tries to persuade people like myself before he has satisfied and begged forgiveness of the most blessed Pope of the holy Church of the Romans, that is, of the Apostolic See, which in all things and through all things commands and has authority and power of binding and loosening over the holy Churches of God all over the world, given by the very Word of God made man, as well as by all holy synods according to the sacred Canons." ² Since then this agreement with the Roman Church is to all these Greeks the standard of orthodoxy, since she is the foundation and basis of the faith, and since our Lord cannot ever make it a condition of true belief to agree with heresy, Pope *St. Agatho* (678-681) is right in telling Constantine III: "The Apostolic Church of Christ (he means the Roman Church) by the grace of Almighty God, will never be shown to have wandered from the path of Apostolic tradition, nor has it ever fallen into heretical novelties; but as it was founded spotless at the time of the beginning of the Christian faith by its founders, the Princes of

¹ Ep. Romæ scripta, ii. 72, ap. Combefis, *l.c.*

² Ep. ad Petrum Illust. M.P.G. xci. 144.

Christ's Apostles, so it remains to the end according to the promise of our Lord and Saviour himself, who says in the holy Gospels to the Prince of his disciples : Peter, Peter, behold Satan sought to have you, that he might sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail, and do you, being converted, confirm your brethren. He bids him confirm his brethren, and it is known to all people that the Apostolic Pontiffs, predecessors of my unworthiness, have always confidently done so." ¹

We have, then, as the belief of these Fathers that (1) Peter was the Prince of the Apostles and the Rock, (2) the Roman Pontiffs succeed him in this office, (3) therefore the Roman Bishop has jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ, (4) and the faith of his Church is the standard of orthodoxy for all Christians. And these four points make up exactly what Catholics believe about the Pope.

We may here add a word about the *Roman Emperors* who reigned at Constantinople. They were always ready to magnify their Patriarch, always shamelessly interfering in ecclesiastical matters, the worst enemies of the liberty of the Church, continually trying to enforce some new ordinance or dogma of their own by their civil power, and so continually in opposition to the Pope. Yet, until Cæsar went into open schism, even Cæsar knew who was the bond of union and the visible centre of the Catholic Church. The Code of Roman Law does not seem the sort of book in which one would find arguments for the Roman Primacy. Yet it contains the edict of *Gratian*, *Valentinian* and *Theodosius* (in 390) : "We desire that all the peoples who are governed by the laws of our Clemency shall profess the religion which Peter, the divine Apostle, taught to the Romans, which is manifest as the one still left there by him, which, as is well known, is followed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic holiness ; that, according to the Apostolic teaching and the faith of the Gospel, we believe in one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in equal majesty in the Holy Trinity. We command that those who follow this law be called

¹ Ep. ad Const. III.

by the name of Catholic Christians, and we judge the others to be mad and foolish to bear the shame of a heretical belief. Nor shall their conventicles be called churches.”¹ St. Damasus was Pope from 366 to 384. With his name the Emperors couple that of Peter, the Patriarch of the second see in Christendom, which had been the bulwark of the faith in Arian times (Athanasius). But the standard by which they measure who is to be called a “Catholic Christian” is the faith left by St. Peter at Rome.

Gratian (Emperor from 375–383 in the West, while Theodosius I reigned in the East) ordered that “those bishops who had been banished (by his Arian predecessors) should be restored to their flocks, and that the sacred buildings should be given to those who embrace the communion of Damasus.”² We have seen what Pope Agatho wrote to *Constantine III* (668–685, cf. p. 60). Constantine answers to Agatho’s successor, Pope Leo II (682–683, Agatho had died meanwhile): “With the eyes of our mind We saw him, as it were the very Prince of the Apostolic choir him as Peter the Bishop of the first See, divinely proclaiming the mystery of the whole dispensation.”³

The great *Justinian* (527–565) in 533 sends a profession of his faith to Pope John II (533–535), whom he calls the “Head of all the Churches.”⁴ He puts into his Codex the profession he had made to Agapitus (535–536) and the Pope’s answer⁵; and he calls the Roman See “the source of the priesthood (fons Sacerdotii)” and “the venerable See of the most high Apostle Peter.” “No one doubts,” he says, “that the height of the Supreme Pontificate is at Rome.”⁶ So well does he know what is the result of schism with the Roman See that, while he is persecuting and ill-using Pope Vigilius (540–555), he imagines a subtle distinction between the Chair of Peter and its occupant, that people may believe that he is in perfect peace with the one while he is harrying the other.⁷

It is usual to speak of the time from Justinian I (527) to

¹ Cod. Theod. xvi. Tit. i. leg. 2.

² Theodoret, H.E. v. 2, M.P.G. lxxxii. 1197.

Const. III, ad Leonem II, M.P.L. xcvi. 701.

⁵ Cod. i. i, 8.

⁶ Lib. Pont. i. 297–299

⁴ Mansi, viii. 795, 845, 847.

⁷ Mansi, ix. 367.

the fall of Constantinople (1453) as the *Byzantine period*. By 527 the Patriarch of New Rome has become the unquestioned chief of all Orthodox Eastern Christians; the other Orthodox Patriarchs are now only his vassals. Byzantium is the centre of the Christian East (as far, at least, as the Empire is concerned); her liturgy is used almost throughout what is left of the Empire; the whole system of Byzantine Canon Law and the customs that accompany it (including the shameless subjection of the things of God to Cæsar that is the special note of this time) are established. After 1453 there is no Empire left and no Cæsar to lord it over his bishops. The Church that is only the despised religion of rayahs under the Sultan has entered upon a new period of her history. The history of that Byzantine time is cut sharply into two unequal portions by the great schism in the 9th century. But until that schism this Byzantine Church, in spite of an ever-growing ill-feeling against Rome among her bishops, accepted and believed in the Pope's Primacy. This belief was an inheritance left to her by the great Greek Fathers, as we have seen. She did not cast it off till the time of Photius. Some of the texts I have already quoted (Eutychius of Constantinople, the Bishop of Patara, Eulogius of Alexandria, Sergius of Cyprus, St. Maximus) belong to this period. Here are more quotations to the same effect:—

In 646 Africa was a province governed by an Imperial (civil) Exarch sent from Constantinople. In that year the *African bishops* write to St. Theodore (Pope from 642–649): “Father of Fathers! in honour of the most holy Apostle Peter, your Apostolic See has received, by divine decree, as a special and unique inheritance, the office of examining and scrutinizing the holy dogmas of the Church.” And further in their letter: “It has been established from the beginning that the Pontiffs of the holy Apostolic See condemn evil and confirm good. It is a rule of ancient Canons¹ that, wherever a question concerning the Church be moved, even in the most distant lands, nothing can be examined nor defined until the matter has been brought before the Apostolic See.”²

¹ They refer to the Council of Sardica in 343, see p. 68. ² Mansi, x. 920, 921.

But these bishops, it may be said, were, in spite of the Emperor's Exarch, Latins. *St. Sophronius of Jerusalem* († 638) was not a Latin. While he was fighting against Monothelism, he chose one of his bishops, Stephen of Dora, to go to Rome, since he could not do so himself. He first takes his envoy to Mount Calvary, and there solemnly adjures him: "Go through all the world," he says, "till you come to the Apostolic See (Rome was a long way off from Jerusalem, and the journey was a dangerous one then), where is the foundation of the Orthodox belief. Tell the most holy persons of that see all about our difficulties: do not cease to beg and entreat them until their Apostolic and divine wisdom shall pronounce the victorious sentence, and shall canonically destroy and root out this new heresy."¹ Stephen comes to Rome several times. The last time was in 649. Before Pope Martin I (649–655) he makes his denunciation: "I desire to denounce Monothelism to the chief see, mistress of all sees; I desire to do so to your highest and divine see, that it may altogether heal the wound. Your see is accustomed to do so since the beginning by its Apostolic and canonical authority. For it is evident that Peter received not only the keys of heaven, he alone amongst all. Besides the keys of heaven this true Head and Prince of the Apostles was first charged to feed the sheep of the whole Catholic Church. . . . He alone was to confirm his colleagues and brethren, since God, who became man for us, gave him power and priestly authority over all. . . . And Sophronius, the former Patriarch of blessed memory, knowing this, told my lowliness without delay to come to this great Apostolic See."²

About 669 two monks of Gangres, *Theodosius* and *Theodore*, wrote an account of the chief adversaries of Monothelism. They call the Martyr-Pope, St. Martin (p. 56), "Supreme and Apostolic Pope, chief of all the priestly hierarchy under the sun, Sovereign and Œcumenical Pope, Apostolic Prince."³

In the 8th century *St. Stephen the Younger* says of the Iconoclastic Synod of Hieria (753): "How can you call a synod œcumenical when the Bishop of Rome has not consented to it,

¹ Mansi, x. 896.

² Ibid. x. 893.

M.P.G. xc 193, 197, 202.

since the Canons forbid ecclesiastical affairs to be settled without the Pope of Rome ?”¹

Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople (784–806), writes to St. Adrian I (Pope from 772–795): “Your Holiness has inherited the see of the divine Apostle Peter. Wherefore lawfully and by the will of God, you preside over all the hierarchy of the Church.”²

It would be tedious to go on quoting from the almost endless number of similar sayings of Byzantine theologians.³ As a last example before the schism, we may take *St. Theodore of Studium* († 826). He was Hegoumenos (abbot) of the famous Monastery Studium (Studion) at Constantinople, which in his time held a thousand monks, a reformer of Greek monasticism according to St. Basil’s rule, and especially a leader of the Orthodox and a heroic confessor in Iconoclast times. We keep his feast on November 12th (in the Martyrology), the Eastern Church on November 11th. No one of the Orthodox saints who were resisting Iconoclasm had more, only St. John Damascene as much influence as this St. Theodore. When he died Photius was just born (probably in the same year, 826); forty years afterwards the schism had broken out. St. Theodore Studita, then, may stand for one of the very last representatives of the old Byzantine Church before the schism. And he speaks very plainly about the Pope’s Primacy. He knows that the Pope of his time (Paschal, 817–824) succeeds to St. Peter’s rights: “To you (he writes) spoke Christ our Lord: And you, being converted, shall confirm your brethren. Behold, now is the time and place: help us, you who are ordained by God for this. Stretch out your hand as far as you can. You have the power from God, since you are Prince of all. Frighten, we beg of you, the heretical beasts (Iconoclasts) with the pen of your divine word. Good shepherd, lay down your life for your sheep, we pray.”⁴ Again: “Since Christ our God gave to the great Peter, after

¹ Vita I. Steph. Iun. M.P.G. C. 1144.

² Pitra: *Iuris eccl. Græc. hist.* Rome, 1864, 1868, vol. ii. 305.

³ Cf., for instance, Pargoire: *L’Église byzantine*, pp. 44, seq., 189, seq., 289, seq.

M.P.G. xcix. 1153.

the keys of the kingdom of heaven, also the right of guiding the sheep, to Peter, then, or to his successor, we must refer whatever novelty is introduced into the Catholic Church by those who wander from the truth.”¹ “Hear us,” he writes again to Pope Paschal, “Apostolic Head, Shepherd set by God over the sheep of Christ, key-bearer of the kingdom of Heaven, Rock of the Faith, on whom is built the Catholic Church, for you are Peter, you who rule the See of Peter.”² So to Rome all questions must go. “If the Emperor,” he writes to the Sacellarius³ Leo, “is not content, if, as he says, the Patriarch Nicephorus has wandered from the truth, both sides should send an embassy to the Roman (Patriarch), and should from him accept the certainty of faith.”⁴

The Emperor Michael II (820-829) had summoned a synod of bishops at Constantinople to discuss the question of images. St. Theodore writes to him in the name of this synod: “If there be anything as to which your Magnificence doubts whether it can be rightly settled by the Patriarch, then order a declaration to be sent for from Old Rome, as heretofore and from the beginning has been the custom, according to the tradition of the Fathers. For she is the first of the Churches of God in which first sat Peter to whom the Lord said: Thou art Peter,” &c.⁵ When Paschal has answered, condemning the Iconoclasts, Theodore writes to a certain Naucratus: “Now, indeed, I say before God and men that the heretics have separated themselves from the Body of Christ, from the supreme see in which Christ has placed the keys of faith, against which the gates of hell have never prevailed, and never shall prevail till the end. Let the most holy, the Apostolic, the beloved Paschal rejoice; he has accomplished the work of Peter.”⁶ St. Theodore then knows that the Pope is universal Primate, that to him we must appeal in questions of discipline and of faith, because he has the “keys of faith

¹ Ep. 33, ad Leonem III, *ibid.* 1017.

² *Ibid.* 1152.

³ The Sacellarius is the officer of the Patriarch's court who has to inspect and defend the monasteries. *Σακελλάριος*, from *Sacellum*, is one of the many Byzantine words derived from Latin.

⁴ M.P.G. xcix. 1420.

⁵ *Ibid.* 1332.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1281.

against which the gates of hell shall never prevail," because from him we receive "the certainty of faith." He also knows that no general council can be called, save under the Pope. He writes to Pope Leo III (795-816): "If they, arrogating authority, have not feared to summon a heretical council, who could not even summon an orthodox one without your authority, according to the ancient custom, how much more is it just and even necessary to hold a lawful one under your divine leadership."¹ Lastly, to be an orthodox Catholic we must be in union with Rome. "Now is the acceptable time," he tells the Emperor, "that we (the Byzantine Church riddled with Iconoclasm) . . . should unite ourselves with Rome, the summit of the Churches of God, and through her to the three other Patriarchs (Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem)."²

It is then with no uncertain voice that this Byzantine Church proclaims her faith in the Roman Primacy and Infallibility just before the tyranny of an Emperor and the ambition of an intruded Patriarch drag her into schism.

2. Appeals to Rome from the East.

This faith of the Eastern Churches did not remain a mere theory. The Fathers we have quoted not only proclaimed the Pope's universal jurisdiction; they continually made use of it to defend themselves against opponents; so that the long list of their appeals to Rome speaks even more eloquently than their words.

As far back as the second century "Irenæus relates that *Polycarp*, who was, even then still alive, came to Rome while Anicetus presided over the Roman Church and conversed with Anicetus about the question of the day of Easter."³ Anicetus reigned c. 157-168, St. Polycarp († c. 166), Bishop of Smyrna, had sat at the feet of St. John the Apostle himself.

The case of Pope *Victor I* (189-199) and the Quartodecimans is well known. It is hardly one of an appeal; but when he "pronounced" those Asiatic bishops "by letters to be outside the unity,"⁴ although St. Irenæus wrote to advise him

¹ M.P.G. xcix. 1020.

² Ibid. 1309.

³ Eus. H.E. iv. 1

⁴ Ibid. v. 24.

not to be so severe,¹ no one questioned his right to excommunicate them. *Dionysius of Alexandria* († 264), "moved by his zeal for religion, had written to Ammonius and Euphranore against the heresy of Sabellius. But certain brothers in the Church, men of sound faith, not knowing the reason for which he had written, went to Rome and accused him to his namesake Dionysius, the Roman Bishop (259-268). He, having heard these things, . . . sent a letter to Dionysius, to tell him what he had been accused of by them. And, in order to clear himself as soon as possible, he wrote books which he called a Compendium and an Apology."² The great *Athanasius* "sought refuge in Rome as in a most safe harbour of his Communion."³ In 340 an Arian Synod at Antioch had professed to depose him, and had set up Gregory of Cappadocia as rival Bishop of Alexandria. Theodoret says: "But Athanasius, already knowing their wiles, went away to Western parts. For the Eusebians (strict Arians), having got together calumnies against Athanasius, had denounced him to Bishop Julius, who at that time administered the Roman Church (337-352). Julius, following the law of the Church, ordered them to come to Rome, and also summoned Athanasius to explain his case. And Athanasius, obeying the summons, started at once on the journey. But they who had made up the fable would not come to Rome, because they knew that their lie would be found out."⁴ The Pope, in a Roman Synod (341), declared St. Athanasius innocent of all their charges and refused to countenance his deposition. He wrote a long letter to these Eusebians, saying among other things: "Do you not know that this is the custom, that you should first write to us, and that what is right should be settled here?"⁵ In 343 the *Council of Sardica* (now Sofia in Bulgaria) met. It drew up twenty Canons, which the second council in Trullo (692) afterwards approved for the Byzantine Church. Canon 3

¹ Eus. *l.c.* : the text of the letter is there. Cf. Hier. de vir. ill. 35.

² Athanasius de sent. Dion. n. 13. ³ Hier. ep. 127 (al. 16), n. 5.

⁴ Theodoret : H.E. ii. 3. M.P.G. lxxxii. 996.

⁵ Ep. 3 Jul. ad. Eus. 22, quoted by St. Athanasius, Apol. c. Arianos, 21-36.

determines that a bishop shall be judged by the other bishops of his province, but "if a deposed bishop thinks he has good cause to demand a new inquiry he shall, out of reverence for the blessed Apostle Peter, write to Rome to Pope Julius, so that he may set up another tribunal from among bishops living near the province and himself appoint a judge." Canon 4 forbids the other bishops to fill his see in this case until the Pope has pronounced his sentence. Canon 5 provides that the Pope shall appoint as judge either a neighbouring bishop or a legate sent from Rome. Hosius of Cordova presided at this synod, and its Canons were often joined to the Canons of Nicæa drawn up eighteen years earlier, so that they were sometimes quoted as Nicene. One hundred and seventy-three bishops sat at Sardica; but it was not an œcumenical council. It was a legitimate and orthodox provincial synod of Eastern bishops recognizing the right of appeal with special reference to the action of St. Athanasius.

In 404 Theophilus of Alexandria unjustly deposed *St. John Chrysostom* from his See of Constantinople. St. John then appealed to Pope Innocent I (401-417),¹ who received his appeal, refused to sanction the deposition,² and made it a condition of communion with Alexander of Antioch that he should have "fulfilled all conditions in the cause of the blessed and truly worthy Bishop John."³ Pope *Boniface I* (418-422), Innocent's successor, settled a dispute in Greece by giving an unpopular bishop another and a better see. Socrates says: "Peregrinus had been ordained Bishop of Patræ. But since the inhabitants of that town would not have him, the Bishop of the City of Rome ordered him to be appointed to the metropolitan See of Corinth, since the bishop of that Church was dead."⁴ After Boniface I came *St. Celestine I* (422-432). He writes to the Illyrian bishops: "You shall notice that, amid the other cares and various business that always

¹ Dial. Palladii de vita Chrys. ii. M.P.G. xlvii. 8-12 (his letter to Innocent is there).

² Ep. Innoc. I. 5.

³ Ep. 19.

⁴ Socr. H.E. vii. 36. M.P.G. lxxvii. 820. However, Greece was in Illyricum, part of his own patriarchate.

come to us from all Churches, we take special care of you," and he says why this various business always comes to him from all Churches: "For we especially are concerned about all, since Christ gave us the duty (*necessitas*) of arranging all things in St. Peter the Apostle when he gave him the keys to open and to shut."¹

St. Jerome (c. 331-420) had been the secretary of Pope Damasus (366-384). Years afterwards he still remembered how much work he had then done: "When I was helping Damasus, Bishop of the City of Rome," he writes, "and was answering the consultations of synods from East and West,"² . . . *Theodoret of Cyrus* († 458) was deposed by the Robber Synod of Ephesus in 449. He at once appeals to Pope Leo the Great: "We beg, and pray, and entreat and humbly implore your Holiness to bring help to the Churches of God that are tossed in this storm. . . . And I await the sentence of your Apostolic See, and I beg and implore your Holiness to help me, who appeal to your right and just tribunal, and to order me to come to you and to show you that my teaching follows in the footsteps of the Apostles. . . . Above all, I beg you to tell me whether I am to accept this unjust deposition or not; for I await your sentence. And if you order me to abide by the judgement, I will do so, and I will no longer trouble any man, but will await the just judgement of God our Saviour."³ At the same time he writes to a Roman priest Renatus (afterwards one of the Legates at Chalcedon): "I beg your Holiness to persuade your most holy and most blessed Archbishop (St. Leo) to use his Apostolic authority and to order us to hasten to your synod. For that most holy see has for many reasons the primacy over the Churches in the whole world, and especially for this reason that it has remained unspotted by heresy, nor has any one of contrary opinion sat therein, but it has kept entire the Apostolic grace. We agree to whatever sentence you may pronounce, trusting in the justice of your judgement."⁴ Nor was

¹ Ep. iii. Coel. M.P.L. l. 427.

² Hier. Ep. 123, 10.

³ Theod. ad Leonem I, 113, M.P.G. lxxxiii. 1316. This letter is the one from which the extract quoted (p. 56) is also taken.

⁴ Ep. 116, Theodoret, ad Renatum, M.P.G. lxxxiii. 1324.

Theodoret's appeal in vain. The acts of the Council of Chalcedon (451) expressly say that St. Leo restored him to his see.¹ The same Robber Synod of Ephesus, in 449, deposed *Flavian of Constantinople*. Liberatus (c. 566), the historian of the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies, says : " Flavian appealed by letter to the Apostolic See, through its legates, against the sentence which had been pronounced against him " ;² and the Emperor Valentinian III (423-455) writes to Theodosius II (408-450), his partner in the East, to explain the matter : " We must," he writes, " in our time, too, keep unchanged the honour of reverence that we owe to the blessed Apostle Peter, inasmuch as that the most blessed Bishop of the Roman city, to whom ancient use has given the primacy of the priesthood over all, must have occasion and power to judge in cases of faith and in the affairs of bishops. . . . Because of this the Bishop of Constantinople, according to solemn use and according to the custom of the Council, has appealed to him by letter."³ Pope *Gelasius I* (492-496), writing to Faustus, his Legate at Constantinople,⁴ and again to the Bishops of Dardania,⁵ and maintaining the ancient law according to which " the appeals of the whole Church come to this see to be examined, but no one may ever appeal from Rome," is able to quote a long list of famous cases to prove his point. The *Syrian archimandrites and monks*, surrounded by Monophysites, appeal to " Hormisdas (Pope, 514-523), the most holy and blessed Patriarch of the whole world, who holds the See of the Prince of the Apostles . . . whom Christ our God has set up as Chief Shepherd and Teacher and Physician of souls."⁶ It was this Pope Hormisdas who drew up the famous formula (p. 85). Pope *Theodore I* (642-649) is not satisfied with the right of Paul to be Patriarch of

¹ Mansi, vi. 590 : " Let the most reverend Bishop Theodoret be admitted because the most holy Archbishop Leo has restored his bishopric to him."

² Lib. Brev. xii. M.P.L. lxxviii. 1006.

³ Val. ad Theod. among St. Leo's letters, 55. Flavian's letter of appeal itself has been found lately. Cf. *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie* (Innsbruck), 1883, pp. 193, seq.

⁴ Ep. 10, Gelas. 5.

⁵ Ep. 26, 5, ad eppos Dardaniæ, M.P.L. cxxxvi. 251.

⁶ Ep. 19, ed. Thiel. an. 517.

Constantinople (641) while Pyrrhus, his predecessor, is still alive. Pyrrhus comes to fall at his feet and is received back into communion.¹ He makes Stephen of Dora Vicar of the holy See for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.² *St. Martin I* (649-655) deposes Peter of Alexandria and Macedonius of Antioch for heresy, and appoints John of Philadelphia his Vicar Apostolic for Syria and Palestine: "In the name of the power we have received from God through St. Peter We order Our brother John to hold Our place in all ecclesiastical affairs of the East and to set up bishops, priests and deacons in all towns that are under the Sees of Antioch and Jerusalem."³ In 717 the Emperor *Leo III* (the Isaurian, 717-741) as soon as he succeeds to the throne sends his profession of faith to Pope Gregory II (715-731).⁴

These cases may stand as examples of the Pope's jurisdiction in the East during the time before the schism. Many more of the same kind will be found quoted in text-books of dogmatic theology.⁵

3. The Popes and the General Councils.

The Roman Primacy over Eastern Christendom is also illustrated by the relations between Popes and œcumenical councils. Seven of these councils were held before the schism. Orthodox Christians then count seven, and only seven, synods as œcumenical; the twelve that we have held since are to them, of course, only local Latin councils, and heretical besides. And we specially do not agree about the *eighth* general council. It was held at the very time of the schism: we count as the œcumenical council the one held in 869 (Constantinople IV), which certainly most fully recognized the Pope's primacy; their eighth council is the one of 879,⁶ to us only a "Pseudosynodus Photiana." We shall come back to these synods in the account

¹ Op. Maximi Conf. M.P.G. xci. 353.

² Mansi, x. 821, 900.

³ Ibid. 805, seq.; 825-832.

⁴ Ibid. xii. 959.

⁵ Cf. *Echos d'Orient*, vi. pp. 30-42, 118-125, 249-257: *Les appels au Pape dans l'Église grecque jusqu'à Photius*.

⁶ Although they always speak of the seven synods, the Church of the Seven Synods and so on, they often call the Council of 879 the eighth œcumenical synod, see p. 156.

of the schism. Leaving, then, this disputed case out of account, we have seven councils acknowledged as œcumenical by both Catholics and Orthodox, namely : (1) Nicæa I (325), (2) Constantinople I (381), (3) Ephesus (431), (4) Chalcedon (451), (5) Constantinople II (553), (6) Constantinople III or Trullanum I (680), (7) Nicæa II (787).

What Catholics believe about general councils is this : Since the Pope is the visible Head of the Church on earth, he alone has the right (1) of summoning a general council, (2) of presiding at it when summoned, (3) of confirming or rejecting its decrees. The analogy with a king and his parliament is obvious. But the Pope may do any of these three things by deputy. He may authorize another person to summon the council, he may preside thereat through his legate, he may even confirm its decrees beforehand, by instructing his legates what they are to agree with, or by sending to the council a standard of orthodoxy to guide it. When the council then follows the Pope's directions, we have already the necessary agreement between the chief and his followers and there is no absolute need of a further papal confirmation.¹ It is difficult to see what other theory will fit the facts. We cannot discover what councils were œcumenical by counting the number of their attendants. Many of them were quite small assemblies ; at Nicæa in 325 about 318 bishops were present, at the second general council only 150, at Ephesus 198, at the sixth 174. On the other hand, the Synod of Ariminum (Rimini) in 359 mustered four hundred bishops ; but it has never been counted œcumenical. Nor would it be possible to make the œcumenical character of a council depend on the attendance of representatives from all parts of the Church. There were very few Western bishops present at any of the earlier general councils, only four at Nicæa,² none at all at the second, two at the third. Still less can the summons or confirmation of the Emperor constitute a general council.

¹ This view (which has been disputed by some Catholic theologians) is that of Cardinal Bellarmin (*de Concilio et Ecclesia*, 2, 11) and of F. X. Funk, in his *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, vol. i. pp. 87-121.

² Cecilian of Carthage, Nicasius from Gaul, Mark from Calabria, Hosius of Cordova.

The Emperor has no commission from Christ to rule the Church, the possibility of holding such councils would depend upon the existence of the Empire, whereas there has been no Emperor in the East since 1453, none in the West since 1805. Lastly, Emperors have summoned and declared as œcumenical such heretical synods as the Iconoclast one ordered by Constantine V in 753 at Hieria. The theory that would find most favour with other Christians would doubtless be that it is the general acceptance of the Church that makes a council œcumenical. But the Church, that is, the great body of the faithful, and their bishops, want to know first whether a synod is œcumenical before they can tell whether it is their duty to accept it. When "the whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian" it would have been of little use to tell a Christian, amid the endless confusion of synods and anti-synods which all claimed to represent the Church, to accept that one as œcumenical which—he and others like himself accepted. Moreover, there has always been a party (often a large party) which rejected these councils. The test of orthodoxy is to accept them; those Christians are orthodox who agree with the general councils. If, then, we say that those councils are general with which the orthodox agree, we have a perfect example of a vicious circle. There remains, then, our position, that an œcumenical synod is one summoned by the Pope,¹ which sits under his presidency as Primate, whose decrees receive the Papal assent. It may, however, happen that a council, which is not œcumenical in itself, receives this character afterwards from the Pope's confirmation; his assent may supply for former irregularities. There are parallel cases in Canon and Civil Law.² The second and fifth general councils are of this nature. Œcumenical neither in their summons nor in their sessions, they became so later through the Pope's assent. And, lastly, the result of this is that only those

¹ That is, summoned as an œcumenical synod. Of course the Pope has often as Bishop of Rome or Metropolitan of his own province summoned a diocesan or provincial synod.

² The *Sanatio in radice* of invalid marriages is a parallel. Charles II of England confirmed most of the acts of the Long Parliament.

acts of a council which receive the Pope's assent have the force of law for Catholics.¹

We will consider, first, the five remaining councils, and then the second and fifth.

The *First Council of Nicæa* (325) was summoned by Constantine. This fact, which is not in dispute, is vouched for by all the historians of that time² and by the synodal letter of the council itself.³ The only question, then, is whether the Emperor was asked or commissioned to do so by the Pope (Sylvester I, 314-335). The matter is uncertain. Rufin says he acted "according to the judgement of the bishops (ex sacerdotum sententia)," and it may be urged that at least one of the bishops concerned was the first Patriarch. The sixth general council (Constantinople III, 680) says so explicitly: "Constantine and Silvester summoned the great Synod of Nicæa,"⁴ so does the *Liber Pontificalis*.⁵ The Emperor had a sort of honorary precedence at the council; but he did not preside. He opened the first session with a speech, and then left the discussion to "the presidents of the synod."⁶ Who were these presidents? In all lists of the members, and especially in the still extant list of subscribers, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, signs first, then two Roman priests who were with him, Vitus and Vincent.⁷ Alexander of Alexandria and Eustathius of Antioch were present; yet this local Spanish bishop and his two priests sign before the great Patriarchs. It would be a mystery, did not Hosius himself give the explanation. He signs expressly "In the name of the Church of Rome, the Churches of Italy, Spain, and all the West."⁸ He and the two priests are

¹ The Council of Constance (1414-1418) in its first thirteen sessions was a schismatical assembly, from the fourteenth to the forty-first a legitimate provincial synod, from the forty-second to the forty-fifth the sixteenth œcumenical council.

² Eusebius: *Vita Const.* iii. 6; Socrates, H.E. i. 8; Sozomen, H.E. i. 17; Theodoret, H.E. i. 7; Rufin. i. 1.

³ Socrates, H.E. i. 9.

⁴ Actio 18. Hardouin, iii. 1417.

⁵ "Factum est concilium cum eius (Sylvestri) præceptum (*sic*) in Nicæa Bithiniæ (*aliter*: cum eius consensu)." Duchesne: *Lib. Pont.* (Paris, 1886), i. 171.

⁶ Eus. *Vita Const.* iii. 13.

⁷ Mansi, ii. 692, 697, 882, 927.

⁸ Ibid. 882, 927.

the legates of their Patriarch. Gelasius of Cyzicus (c. 475) says so, too, in his history of the council.¹ As far then as we have any evidence as to who presided, it points to the Papal Legates. We know nothing about any definite act of confirmation by the Pope, but the Roman Church undoubtedly accepted the decrees of which she (except for the one moment of weakness of Liberius)² was always the chief defender.³

The *Council of Ephesus* (431) was summoned by the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III. So it repeatedly declares in its acts, in the first session: "The synod gathered together by the oracle of the most God-beloved and Christ-loving sovereigns."⁴ So little did these sovereigns conceive themselves as acting for the Pope that they sent him (St. Celestine I, 422-432) an invitation too.⁵ But when the Fathers had met they acknowledged Celestine's primacy. He had already written to St. Cyril of Alexandria,⁶ telling him to excommunicate Nestorius, if he did not repent,⁷ now he sent as additional legates two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, and a priest, Philip, telling them to be on Cyril's side in everything, as he was already authorized to act in the name of the Roman

¹ Mansi, ii. 806. M.P.G. lxxxv. 1179, *seq.* But Gelasius is no great authority.

² It is uncertain how Pope Liberius (352-366) fell. He was at first a steadfast defender of the Creed of Nicæa, but after a long banishment he seems to have somehow given way to the semi-Arians, and he was then allowed by the Emperor (Constantius) to come back to Rome. Perhaps he accepted an ambiguous formula (the third Sirmian form). Rufin says that he does not know whether he gave way at all (H.E. i. 27. M.P.L. xxi. 493). In any case there is no question of a definition *ex cathedra*, and all theologians agree that a Pope may be guilty of a private heretical opinion. B. Jungmann has discussed the whole case in his *Dissertationes selectæ in historiam ecclesiasticam*, ii. pp. 46, *seq.* See also Hefele: *Conc.-Gesch.* (ed. 2), i. pp. 685, 696.

³ Funk: *K.-G. Abhandl.* 94-99.

⁴ Hard. i. 1354.

⁵ Theodos. II, Edict. and Epist. Mansi, iv. 1109, 1111, 1118.

⁶ The acts of the council formally declare Cyril to be the Pope's Legate: "The Alexandrine Cyril, who also holds the place of Celestine, the most holy and most blessed Archbishop of the Church of the Romans . . . being present" (Mansi, iv. 1280). Philip is also called "priest and legate of the Apostolic See," and Arcadius and Projectus are "the most pious and God-beloved bishops and legates" (ibid. 1281).

⁷ Coel. ep. 16-19. Mansi, iv. 1292.

Church, not to let themselves be mixed up in controversy, but to behave as judges.¹ He also writes to the synod, recommending his legates, telling the fathers to observe Canon Law and not to quarrel, and saying that he is convinced that they will agree with the condemnation of Nestorius that he has already pronounced. He thank Theodosius for the trouble he has taken.² The legates arrive late³; when they come, Philip speaks for them: "There is no doubt, indeed it is known to all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, Prince and Chief of the Apostles, column of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom, and that the power of forgiving and retaining sins was given to him, and he till the present time and always lives and judges in his successors. Therefore his successor and Vicegerent, our holy and most blessed Pope, the Bishop Celestine, has sent us to this synod to take his place."⁴ The legates are then shown the Acts of the first session, which they had missed; they approve of them, and read St. Celestine's letter to the synod. Firmus, Exarch of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, then declares that the Fathers have only done what the Pope had bidden. The legates approve of everything and sign the Acts. Meanwhile Candidian, the Emperor's representative, had received orders from his master to look after things and keep order, but not to interfere in questions of faith.⁵ The Acts of Ephesus were not afterwards confirmed by the Pope. He had told the council what to do and it had obeyed him. There was already the necessary agreement between Pope and council, a further confirmation would have been superfluous. St. Celestine's successor, Sixtus III (432-440), writes to St. Cyril that the Nestorians may be received again into communion by him "if they repent and reject what the holy synod with our approbation has rejected."⁶ But this approbation means chiefly the consent between the Fathers and the legates when the synod was sitting.

¹ Ep. Coelest. *cit.*

² Ep. *cit.*

³ On July 10th, at the beginning of the second session.

⁴ Hard. i. 1478.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 1279, 1303, 1391, 1427; v. 602, 686.

⁶ Hard. i. 1709.

The *Council of Chalcedon* (451) was the largest assembly that the Church had ever seen; 630 bishops met at it. It is also for all time the great touchstone of Orthodoxy in the East. Nearly all the great schisms that have cut away branches from the Eastern Church (except Nestorianism) are Monophysite, and Chalcedon condemned Monophysism. The Copts, Jacobites, Armenians, &c., are still out of communion with Constantinople, as well as with Rome, because they reject the Council of Chalcedon. We have already seen how clearly this council acknowledges the Roman Primacy (pp. 36, 37). No synod ever more entirely satisfied the conditions we require. St. Leo the Great formally asked the Emperor to summon it. He wrote to Theodosius II: "All the Churches of our parts, all bishops, with sighs and tears, beg your clemency to order a general council to meet in Italy."¹ Theodosius died too soon (450), and Marcian (450-457), his successor, did not fix on Italy as the place for the council. But he was very conscious that in summoning the council he was obeying the Pope. He writes to St. Leo that he will do as he wishes "so that, when all impious error has been removed through the council held by your authority, a great peace may reign among all bishops of the Catholic faith."² St. Leo answers, asking him now to wait awhile, because at that moment wars and troubles would prevent many bishops from attending.³ But Marcian had summoned the council to Chalcedon, just across the water opposite Constantinople, before the Pope's letter arrived. So St. Leo accepts what has happened: "Since you, out of zeal for the Catholic faith, have wished the council to take place now, I send my brother and fellow-bishop Paschasius, from that province which seems safest⁴ to stand in my place, in order that I may not appear to stand in the way of your goodwill."⁵ He then writes to the Fathers at Chalcedon: "The general council has come together by command of the

¹ Leonis I, Ep. 44, 3. M.P.L. liv. 826.

² Ep. 73. M.P.L. liv. 899.

³ Ep. 83, 2. Ibid. 920.

⁴ He was Bishop of Lilybæum in Sicily. Attila and his Huns were then ravaging Italy. They came to the gates of Rome the year after the council 452.

⁵ Ep. 89. M.P.L. liv. 930.

Christian princes (Marcian and his wife Pulcheria), and by the consent of the Apostolic See.”¹ There is no question as to who presided. First sat the Roman Legates, then Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, &c. (p. 36).² The Legates in the Pope’s name condemn and suspend Dioscur of Alexandria (p. 14). The council accepts St. Leo’s dogmatic letter, “Peter has spoken by Leo” (p. 37). We have also seen how (although it was no longer necessary) the council begs for the Pope’s approval, how he confirms the dogmatic decrees it had passed with his Legates, and rejects the Canons drawn up in their absence (pp. 40–42).

Passing over for the present the fifth council, we come to the *sixth, Constantinople III*, in 680. It met in a hall of the Emperor’s palace under a great cupola, and is therefore also called the first council in Trullo (Trullanum I).³ This is the council that came at the end of the Monothelite troubles; it has become famous because it counted Pope Honorius (625–638) among the Monothelite heretics. In the thirteenth session: “We also anathematize Honorius, the former Pope of Old Rome, because we find in his letter to Sergius that he followed this one in all things and confirmed his impious dogmas.” And in the sixteenth session: “Anathema to the heretic Sergius, Anathema to the heretic Honorius, Anathema to the heretic Pyrrhus.”⁴ In spite of this, the council has several things to say in favour of the Roman Primacy. The Emperor Constantine IV (Pogonatus, 668–685), before summoning it wrote to Pope Donus (676–678) asking for his co-operation and for legates.⁵ Donus died too soon, but Agatho, his successor (678–681), first held a Roman Synod (Easter, 680) to prepare the great one, then sent two priests, Theodore and George, and a deacon John, as his Legates to Constantinople, besides writing a dogmatic letter to Constantine condemning

¹ Ep. 114, I. Ibid. 1029.

² Mansi, vi. 566, &c., *passim*.

³ *Τροῦλλον* is a late Greek word for a hollow vessel, then for a tortoise-shell and lastly for a dome or cupola. Trullus also occurs in late Latin. The second council in Trullo was not œcumenical, see p. 92, n. 2.

⁴ Mansi, xi. 195–736, 738–922. Hard. iii. 1043, *seq.*

⁵ Hard. iii. 1043.

the heresy.¹ The Legates presided at the council, the Emperor was present at many sessions without interfering in the discussion.² The Legates read out Agatho's letter, and the Fathers say to Constantine: "The supreme Prince of the Apostles agreed with us, we had his follower and the successor of his see as our ally explaining the divine mystery in his letter. That ancient City of Rome sent you a profession of faith written by God, and the daylight of the faith shone from the West. We saw parchment and writing, but Peter spoke through Agatho."³ They write to the Pope that he "stands on the firm Rock of Faith."⁴ They ask for his confirmation: "We have, in company with you, clearly taught the Orthodox faith, and we ask your Holiness to sign it with your venerable rescript."⁵ Meanwhile Agatho died and Leo II (682-683) followed him. Leo examined the Acts and confirmed them all, except that he distinctly refused to acknowledge the condemnation of Honorius as a heretic. He, too, condemned him, but only because "he had not crushed out the flame of heresy at once, as behoved his Apostolic authority, but rather fostered it by his negligence."⁶ So the statement made by the council that Honorius was a heretic, not having been confirmed by Rome, affects us Catholics as little as the Canons of Constantinople I.⁷

The seventh general council in 787, at Nicæa (*Nicænum II*), condemned Iconoclasm. The Empress Irene (Regent for her son Constantine VI, 797-802) and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Tarasius (784-806), both wrote in the first place to Pope Adrian I (772-795) about summoning a general synod. Adrian answered in two long letters. He rejoices at their Orthodox disposition and at their wish to put an end to the heresy that has so long cut them off from the Communion of the Roman See. He writes a long defence of holy images from the Bible and

¹ Hard. iii. 1074.

² Mansi, *l.c.*

³ Hard. iii. 1422, *seq.*

⁴ Mansi, xi. 683.

⁵ Hard. iii. 1631-1633.

⁶ Mansi, xi. 1050, M.P.L. xcvi. 414.

⁷ The famous Honorius question does not sufficiently concern the Eastern Churches to warrant a longer discussion of it here. Apart from the statement made by this council, it is quite certain that he did not define Monothelitism *ex cathedra*. Cf., for instance, Jungmann: *Dissert. hist.* ii. pp. 385, *seq.*

the Fathers, he will send his Legates to the synod. This letter he gives to the Archpriest Peter and to the Abbot of St. Saba at Rome, also named Peter, who are to represent him. These Legates preside throughout the council ; the Acts always name them first, then Tarasius.¹ But Tarasius opened the proceedings with a speech and conducted most of the business. The Empress sent two representatives, who, as usual, have the place of honour, but do not interfere. About three hundred bishops were present. The Pope's letter is read out, containing the words : " The See of Peter shines as holding the Primacy over the whole world and stands as head of all the Churches of God " ; also, " Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, who first sat on the Apostolic throne, left the Primacy of his Apostleship and of his pastoral care to his successors, who shall always sit on his most sacred chair, to whom he, by divine command, left the power of authority given to himself by God our Lord and Saviour." ² And " the holy synod answered : The whole most sacred synod so believes, is so convinced, so teaches." ³ Adrian soon after writes to Charles the Great, telling him how the council had condemned Iconoclasm as he had directed, and adding, " Therefore we accepted the synod " ; ⁴ he also had the Acts translated into Latin.

Our eighth general council, the *Fourth of Constantinople* (869), was as papal in its feeling as any council could be. It signed the formula of Hormisdas (*cf.* pp. 85-86) ; nor are the facts that it was summoned by the Pope, presided over by his Legates, and confirmed by him, in dispute. Unfortunately, when the Orthodox speak of the eighth general council they mean, not this one, but Photius' synod, held ten years later (879), that was as anti-papal as ours was papal. The ways had already parted. The story of these rival synods is part of that of the great schism (p. 156). There remain the two irregular councils, the second and the fifth. We have already seen that the second council (*Constantinople I*, in 381) was not œcumenical as summoned nor in its sessions. It was a small local synod of Eastern bishops, presided over successively by three Patriarchs of Constanti-

¹ Hard. iv. 455-470, 995.

³ Ibid. 82, 94.

² Ibid. 102, 510.

⁴ Ibid. 819.

nople. The Pope was not represented ; no Western bishop was present (p. 32). We have also seen that at first the council was not accepted, but that the Pope eventually accepted its Creed, while rejecting its Canons (pp. 33-34). It is that acceptance alone that to Catholics gives this synod a right to be counted among the general councils. Indeed it is difficult to see what other claim it can have. Practically it owes its importance entirely to the Creed it drew up as an enlargement of the Creed of Nicæa, and that we still call the Nicene Creed.¹

The *Second Council of Constantinople* (553) is a parallel case. Justinian wanted a council to condemn the "Three Chapters." These Three Chapters were : 1. The person and the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia († 428). 2. The writings of Theodoret of Cyrus († 458). 3. The letter of Ibas of Edessa († 457) to a certain Persian named Maris. They were all suspected of Nestorianism, and the Emperor hoped that their condemnation would conciliate the Monophysites in Egypt and Syria, who stood for the extreme opposite side. Others, especially the Western bishops, saw in the condemnation a dangerous concession to the Copts and Jacobites. The weakness of the Pope, Vigilius (540-555), may be partly excused because of the persecution he had to bear. At first he agreed to the summoning of a general council. The Emperor then invited him to Constantinople, and, after much hesitation and delay, he arrived there in 547. But he was torn between the two sides. Mennas of Constantinople (536-552), the Emperor, and the Eastern bishops wanted the Three Chapters to be condemned, on the other hand his own Latin bishops saw in the proposed condemnation a veiled attack against the Council of Chalcedon. In 548 he declared the condemnation in his *Iudicatum*, while strongly upholding Chalcedon. The Western bishops were very angry. Then Justinian, in defiance of his promise, before the council met, published a much sharper decree against the Three Chapters. Vigilius protested, and was taken prisoner and ill-treated by the Emperor's order. He gave, and then retracted, his consent to a council. In any case the

¹ It is doubtful whether the Creed really was drawn up by this council (p. 383, n. 3).

Western bishops would not come to it. The council met in May, 553; 165 bishops were present, all Easterns, except six Africans. They asked the Pope to preside, but he would not come. Instead he sent them a new decree, the *Constitutum*, condemning sixty propositions of Theodore, but forbidding any other condemnation. The council refused to accept the *Constitutum*, and condemned all Three Chapters, also, among others, Origen.¹ At last Vigilius, deserted by all his friends, worn out with the long imprisonment and the ill-treatment, only anxious to be set free and to go back home to Rome, gave in and also condemned the Three Chapters. He was then allowed to go back, but the unhappy Pope never saw his own city again. He died of the effects of ill-treatment at Syracuse in 555, leaving the reputation of a well-meaning man who was not strong enough to bear persecution, or to firmly make up his mind in a difficult question. He was the weakest of all the Popes. His successor, Pelagius I (555-561), confirmed the council, which was then, after some opposition, accepted by all the West; although one see, Aquileia, stayed in schism till 700, because of this question. It need hardly be said that all the dogmatic decrees of the Second Council of Constantinople entirely agree with the faith of Ephesus and Chalcedon. No one has disputed its orthodoxy. The question about which Vigilius could not make up his mind was whether it was expedient to condemn men who had died a century ago, whose names, in the West at any rate, were hardly known, for the chance of conciliating these Monophysites. The Western bishops were angry at the Emperor's interference, at their Pope being taken to Constantinople and ill-treated there. If they thought the council was contradicting Chalcedon, they were mistaken. Its 5th Canon formally confirms the last council.²

We may end this discussion of the Roman Primacy over Eastern Christendom by quoting the famous *Formula of Hormisdas*. St. Hormisdas was Pope from 514 to 523. The great

¹ Can. 11, 12, 13, 14.

² For the history of the Three Chapters and of the Second Council of Constantinople see Liberatus: *Breviarium Causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* (M.P.L. lxxiii.). The Acts of the council are in Mansi, ix. 163.

work of his reign was to put an end to the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches that had lasted thirty-five years (484-519), which we call the Acacian Schism. It was the result of another of the many unhappy interferences of the Emperor in ecclesiastical affairs. In 482 the Emperor Zeno (474-491) tried to win the Egyptian and Syrian Monophysites by condemning the Council of Chalcedon. This he did in his *Henotikon* (*Ἐνοτικόν*, Unification), at the same time, to please the Melkites as well, condemning Nestorius and Eutyches. Acacius (Akakios) of Constantinople (471-489), who was quarrelling with John Talaia, the Melkite Patriarch of Alexandria, warmly accepted the *Henotikon*, as did nearly all the Eastern bishops. Peter the Dyer of Antioch (p. 48) and most of the Monophysites also agreed. So a great union between the Byzantine Church and these heretics was brought about. The Copts and Jacobites were once more at peace with Constantinople and Cæsar, but at the cost of sacrificing a general council. The Orthodox had given up their orthodoxy and had conceded what the heretics wanted. Pope Felix II (483-492) protested against the *Henotikon* and, as the Eastern Church persisted in accepting it, the first great schism between the Churches was brought about. Acacius and his bishops struck the Pope's name off their diptychs ; there was no inter-communion for thirty-five years. Only the "Akoimetai," the "sleepless" monks in the capital, still kept up communion with Rome. It was this state of things to which Hormisdas at last succeeded in putting an end. There had already been insurrections and tumults among the people in favour of re-union. The Eastern bishops also began to be frightened when they saw how far things had gone ; already in 512 they had written to Pope Symmachus (Hormisdas's predecessor, 498-514) "begging for the Communion of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles ; and they maintain by letters and embassies that they will obey the Apostolic See."¹ In 516 John of Nicopolis and his suffragans implored Hormisdas to restore them to his communion, and eagerly protested their orthodoxy and their adherence to Chalcedon. The Pope then sends a sub-deacon named Pullio

¹ Thiel, *Ep. Rom. Pont.* 709, 759.

with a "Libellus," which was to be signed by every bishop as a condition of re-union. At first the Emperor (Anastasius I) stood in the way ; but when he died in 518 his successor, Justin I (518-527), wrote, as well as the Patriarch (John II, 518-520), asking the Pope to receive them back. Hormisdas sent Legates with the same Libellus. The Patriarch, the Emperor, and all the chief bishops signed it, the names of Zeno and Acacius were struck out of the diptychs, that of the Pope restored. On Easter Day, 519, the union was restored in the Cathedral of Constantinople. This Libellus is the *Formula of Hormisdas*. It was signed in 516 by all the Illyrian bishops,¹ in 517 the Spanish Church forbade any Greek priest to be admitted to communion until he had signed it,² in 519 all the Eastern prelates signed ;³ Epiphanius (520-536) and Mennas (536-552) of Constantinople and the great Justinian signed.⁴ The Legates who present it allow no discussion, *Roma locuta est*. Certain bishops in Thessaly want to change some of its words. The Legates tell them : "It is not in your power to do this ; if you will sign, thank God ; if you will not, we have come and greeted you, we will now walk away."⁵ At the Council of 869 (our eighth general council) Greeks and Latins sign this formula ; it was confirmed by the two re-union councils, the second of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Florence (1439), and it played a great part at the Vatican Council (1870).

The formula, then, is as follows : "The first salvation⁶ is to keep the rule of the true faith and in no way to forsake the laws of the Fathers. And the words of our Lord Jesus Christ : Thou art Peter and upon this Rock I will build my Church, cannot be passed over ; they are proved by the facts,⁷ because *in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion is always kept immaculate*. We then, wishing by no means to be parted from that hope and faith, following also in everything the laws of the Fathers, anathematize all

¹ Thiel, *l.c.* Ep. 19, p. 780.

² Ep. 26, p. 793.

³ Ep. 46, p. 835 ; Ep. 59, 60, p. 850, *seq.* ; Ep. 61, 65, 75, pp. 852, 859, 868.

⁴ Mansi, viii. 436, 502, 518, 1029, 1065. See also the whole story in Liberatus : *Breviarium*, *l.c.* c. 19.

⁵ "Si non vultis facere, venimus, salutavimus vos, perambulamus," Ep. 49, Thiel, *l.c.*

⁶ = Condition of salvation.

⁷ "Rerum probantur effectibus."

heresies, especially the heretic Nestorius, sometime Bishop of the City of Constantinople, who was condemned at the Council of Ephesus by the blessed Celestine, Pope of the City of Rome, and by Cyril, Bishop of the City of Alexandria. We also anathematize both Eutyches and Dioscur of Alexandria, condemned by the holy Synod of Chalcedon, which we follow and embrace and which, following the holy Nicene Synod, taught the Apostolic Faith. We detest that parricide Timothy, called the Cat,¹ also his disciple and follower Peter of Alexandria. We likewise condemn and anathematize Acacius, some time Bishop of Constantinople, who was condemned by the Apostolic See, and who was the accomplice and follower of those others, and all who remained in their communion; because Acacius justly deserves the same condemnation as theirs for having mixed himself up in their society. Further, we condemn Peter of Antioch with all his followers and the followers of all the above-mentioned. We receive and approve all the letters of the blessed Pope Leo, which he wrote about the Christian religion; and, as we have said, we follow the Apostolic See in everything and teach all its laws. Therefore, I hope that I may deserve to be with you in that one Communion taught by the Apostolic See, *in which Communion is the whole, real and perfect solidity of the Christian Religion*. And I promise that in future I will not say in the holy Mysteries the names of those who are banished from the Communion of the Catholic Church, *that is, who do not agree with the Apostolic See*. And if in any way I ever attempt to depart from this my profession, I acknowledge that by my own sentence I shall become an accomplice of those whom I have condemned. This my profession I sign with my own hand and address to you, Hormisdas, the holy and venerable Pope of the City of Rome.”² We may, then, end our list of evidences of the Roman Primacy in the East with this formula of the early 6th century, than which certainly nothing could be plainer.

¹ See p. 14. He is only called a parricide because he was a Monophysite.

² Denzinger, xx. n. 141. The text of Hormisdas's formula often recurs in Acts of councils and letters: *cf. e. gr.* Deusdedit: Coll. Canonum, i. 112, pp. 89, 90, &c.

4. Ill-feeling towards Rome in the East.

But there is also another side to the question. It is certain that the whole body of Eastern orthodox Christians would not have so easily fallen away from communion with the West and with the Pontiff whom they had so often acknowledged as their chief, if everything had been going quite smoothly till the 9th century. The violent language against Rome, the hatred of everything Latin, that we see among these Byzantines as soon as the schism breaks out, were caused by deeper motives than the disputed succession of Ignatius and Photius. The Filioque in the Creed, our use of unleavened bread and habit of fasting on Saturday, could not be the only causes of so much bitterness. It is true that long before Photius was born an ill-feeling against Latins and against the Latin Patriarch had been growing up at Constantinople. This ill-feeling shows itself most plainly during the last three centuries before the schism, during the Byzantine period, since Justinian. But even earlier there was often friction. In the first place we do not often find among these Eastern bishops the same enthusiasm for Rome as among Latins: they acknowledged its primacy, but more coldly. Words like St. Jerome's impassioned appeal to Pope Damasus¹ are the expression of the feelings of a Latin surrounded by Greeks and Syrians. To Christians of the Eastern Churches the Pope was always more of a stranger. He was not their Patriarch. Whereas he governed, guided, advised his own Latin bishops continually, sent his Pallium to archbishops, was appealed to in every sort of difficulty,² Eastern Christians in similar cases looked to their own patriarchs. True, they could appeal from them to the first see, the Synod of Sardica had said so (p. 69), and we have seen a number of cases; but such appeals were rather the exception, brought about by some flagrant injustice. The normal life of those Churches went on without much reference to Rome.

Then they had not been founded by the Pope. To our fathers the Roman Church was mother and mistress in many

¹ Ep. 15, ad Damasum.

² An example of this is the correspondence between St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine of Canterbury.

senses ; their loyalty saw in her, not only the Church of the Prince-Apostle, not only the Patriarchal See ; she was the mother who had borne them. From Rome, sent by a Pope, had come the apostles to whom they owed the faith, it was Rome that had founded their dioceses, ordained their first bishops. In the case of the great Eastern Churches there was no such special relation of filial piety. Their bishops traced their lines straight back to the first disciples of all, many of them were themselves Apostolic Churches and therefore, in this regard, on the same level as Rome. They had their own ancient liturgies and customs and had never been affected by the Roman use, the Roman Calendar. True, in the West, too, there were other liturgies, but all the time the Roman Mass was spreading throughout the Pope's Patriarchate, influencing the other Latin rites, till at last it took their place everywhere, save in one or two corners. The Papal Mass, the "use of the Roman Curia" throughout the West was the great architype to be admired and copied ; but to Eastern Christians it was an utterly strange thing, of which they understood nothing, not even the language.

It seems absurd to us that a difference of language should be so great a barrier ; but it is true that one of the great causes of estrangement between the two halves of Christendom was that they could not understand each other, simply because some talked Latin and some Greek. Here Rome had the advantage. There was always a Greek colony there and Greek monasteries. There have been, even as late as in the 7th and 8th centuries, Greek Popes.^{*} So the Romans could always manage to get a Greek letter translated. But the Greeks could not understand Latin. The Roman Court since it had been fixed at Constantinople had become completely Hellenized. The whole body of Latin literature, sacred or profane, was a closed book to the Byzantines. At first Law, the *Ius Romanum*, had still been taught in Latin and St. Gregory the Wonder-worker († 270),

^{*} Theodore I (642-649) was a Greek from Jerusalem, St. Agatho (678-681), a Sicilian Greek, John V (685-686), a Syrian. The last Greek Pope was a Cretan, Alexander V (Peter Philargios, 1409-1410), set up by the Synod of Pisa. He is counted among the Alexanders, but was really an anti-pope. Gregory XII (1406-1415) was the legitimate Pope.

who wanted to study it, complains that he must first learn "the hard language of the Romans."¹ But since Justinian even Law was written in Greek, and from that time there were very few Greeks who could speak Latin. Peter of Antioch received a letter from Pope Leo IX (1048-1054)² and he had to send it to Constantinople to have it translated. Even Photius, the most learned man of his age, could not understand Latin. On the other hand, Pope Vigilius (540-555) spent eight unhappy years at Constantinople, but amid his troubles he never learned Greek. The Popes kept a perpetual Legate, the Apocrisarius, at the Emperor's Court since the time of Justinian; but even these Legates generally knew no Greek. St. Gregory the Great († 604) had been Apocrisarius at Constantinople, but he never knew any language except Latin. This difference of language was a very serious hindrance to the mutual influence that would have prevented the Churches from drifting apart.³ And so, since the Pope and his Latin Court were so strange to these Greeks, since his intervention was rare in their affairs, it must have often seemed to them, when he did stretch out his arm across the seas, that he was interfering unduly in their business. One can imagine an Eastern bishop, such as Theophilus of Alexandria, for instance (p. 69), who was congratulating himself on having triumphed, suddenly finding that his arrangements were all reversed by the result of his adversary's appeal to Rome, and thinking in his disappointment: Why cannot the Roman Patriarch let things alone?

But undoubtedly the chief cause of all ill-feeling was the ambition of Constantinople. We have seen how the bishops of that city step by step climbed up to the first place in the East; how easily they displaced the other Eastern Patriarchs; how they could always count on the help of the Emperor; and how the adversary, who always stood in their way, was the Pope. They could not pretend to ignore him, and at each step they foresaw his certain opposition. It was most of all in the minds of the Œcumenical Patriarchs that anger and jealousy

¹ M.P.G. x. 963, *seq.*

² Will: *Acta et Scripta de contro. eccl. lat. et græcæ*, p. 204.

³ See Duchesne: *Églises séparées*, pp. 182-186.

against Old Rome rankled. And when the schism at last came it was natural that it should be caused by a dispute between these two sees. Nor is it to be wondered that when Constantinople fell away, all the other Eastern Sees held by her and shared her schism. By that time Constantinople was almost as unquestioned a mistress of the Orthodox East as Rome was of the Catholic West. The great mass of the populations of Egypt and Syria had long ago fallen away from both and had nothing to do with the schism of the 9th century. What was left was the Byzantine Church, and its chief was the Œcumenical Patriarch.

We must confess that Rome had sometimes given these Eastern Christians cause for discontent. Of course nothing can justify schism ; they had so often protested that at Rome still stood the Rock on which Christ had built his Church, they had so often acknowledged the Pope's right as Supreme Judge. Still, the most rightful judges have made mistakes ; if we look for the cause of the anger against Rome which made the schism possible, we shall have to put at any rate some of it down to the account of Rome herself. It is not difficult to find examples. As far back as the 4th century she had taken a line in the *Meletian schism* at Antioch¹ that every one now regrets. In 330 Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, was banished by the Arians ; as usual they set up an Arian rival bishop, and when he died they carried on that line. Many of the Catholic Antiochenes seem to have accepted these Arian bishops ; but a small party still clung to exiled Eustathius. In 360 the Arian bishop Eudoxius died ; in 361 his party elected Meletius, Bishop of Sebaste, to succeed him. But this time they had made a mistake. Meletius showed himself to be Homoousian and Catholic ; so they chose a real Arian, Euzoius, instead of him. But Meletius, whom they had banished, soon came back, still claiming to be Patriarch of Antioch, and he was supported by most of the Catholics. There were now three parties at Antioch, the Arians under Euzoius, and two Catholic parties, the larger one under Meletius and a small body of rigid

¹ Not to be confused with the schism of Meletius of Lycopolis in Egypt (c. 306).

conservatives who still looked upon Eustathius as the rightful bishop, in which, after all, they were strictly right. But when at last Eustathius died, his party would have undoubtedly fallen in with the other Catholics and accepted Meletius, there would then have been only the two parties, Catholic and Arian, as there were throughout the Empire, but for the ill-considered action of a Latin bishop. Lucifer of Calaris* was always over-eager and intolerant in the pride of his untarnished orthodoxy. Later he made a schism in Italy, because he would not allow converted Arians to be restored to their office. Now he perpetuates the schism at Antioch. Without a shadow of right—at any rate he had no jurisdiction in Syria—he ordains a successor to Eustathius, a certain Paulinus. So the two Catholic parties remain separate and the schism goes on. When Meletius died (381) his party choose Flavian, after Paulinus the Eustathians appoint Evagrius. Unhappily Rome stood by what Lucifer had done: she and Alexandria acknowledged the Eustathian line, all the rest of the East was for Meletius. The disagreement about the succession at Antioch did not, however, disturb good relations in other matters. St. John Chrysostom, for instance, was a devoted friend to Meletius and had been ordained by Flavian, yet he was on equally good terms with the Pope, to whom he appealed in his own trouble (p. 69). It was chiefly St. John who at last brought about peace. He and Theophilus of Alexandria arranged that Flavian should send an embassy to Rome in 398, asking to be recognized, and that the Pope should grant what he asked. No successor was appointed to Flavian's rival Evagrius († 392). Still a remnant of the Eustathian party, although without a bishop of their own, refused to acknowledge the Patriarchs of the Meletian line till 415. Then they, too, gave in. Alexander of Antioch, Flavian's second successor, went with all his court and his clergy to hear the liturgy in their church, and they all sang psalms together. After eighty-five years at last the schism was over. The Roman Church has put the name of St. Meletius in her Martyrology, "giving the honour of her altars after death to him to whom she

* Now Cagliari in Sardinia.

refused her communion while alive.”¹ But the action of Lucifer, and of Rome in supporting him, had been a deplorable mistake. There were other cases of the same kind. At Laodicea all the East acknowledged Pelagius, Rome Apollinaris,² the future heretic († c. 385). In these and similar cases the Pope (St. Damasus, 366–384) knew of Eastern affairs almost entirely through Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was in exile at Rome, and who, of course, described everything from his own point of view. It was not always quite a fair one. Peter had suffered much from Arians and semi-Arians; he was very loyal to the old friends in Syria who, with him, had borne the long persecution, he was inclined to look rather askance on the new school of bishops, who, although they were now defending the faith of Nicæa, had been the pupils of a suspect tradition. It was from the school of such people as Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Macedonius, all semi-Arians, that the great Cappadocians, St. Basil and the two Gregories had come,³ and it was owing to the old hatred of Alexandria for those semi-Arians that Peter and even Damasus were disposed to look somewhat coldly upon the great Greek Fathers, whose orthodoxy was really as untarnished as their own. Indeed, the traditional close alliance between the two first sees, Rome and Alexandria, often caused friction between Rome and the other Eastern Churches. Continually one sees that Antioch and Constantinople on the one side are opposed to Alexandria on the other : and Rome was nearly always for Alexandria.

Gradually another cause of resentment grew up against the Latins. Although the Greeks generously did their part in spreading the Gospel on all sides they always had a feeling that the full perfection of the Christian Church involved the Roman Empire. Optatus of Milevis († 400) had said so in Africa : “The Commonwealth is not in the Church, but the Church is

¹ For all this story see Socrates : H.E. ii. 43 ; iii. 9, 25 ; v. 5, 9, 15. Sozomenos : H.E. iv. 25 ; vii. 3, 10, *seq.* ; viii. 3. Theodoret : H.E. iii. 2, 8 ; v. 23, 25.

² St. Basil, Ep. 131, 2 ; 224, 2 (M.P.G. xxxii. 568, 836, *seq.*).

³ Cf. Duchesne : *Églises séparées*, pp. 85, *seq.*

in the Commonwealth, that is, in the Roman Empire.”¹ One constantly finds this feeling that the cause of Cæsar is the cause of Christ,² and the more the Eastern bishops began to look upon the Emperor as their chief, the more obvious it must have seemed. But gradually Old Rome was falling away from the Empire. The Fathers of Chalcedon had pretended that she held the primacy because she was the capital of the Empire, and now the very city that had given her name to the Roman world could hardly be counted any longer as part of that world. In 401 the Goths had poured into Italy; in 410 they had plundered Rome; in 452 the Huns had only just not done so too (St. Leo turned them back), but they had overrun the Roman land. Then the East-Goths set up a kingdom in Italy (493-555) in open defiance of Cæsar, and soon after came the Lombards (568). The Bishop of Old Rome sat in the midst of barbarians, and, what is worse, he began to have friendly relations with them. They heard that he had made the closest alliance with a barbarian king; that the Franks were encouraged by him to conquer the Lombard kingdom, and, instead of giving it back to Cæsar, to keep it themselves. At last came the final blow. In 800, in his own cathedral he crowned their king Emperor, set up a rival Augustus, ignoring the rightful line that still went on at New Rome. It must have seemed to the Byzantine bishops sheer high treason. They would never acknowledge Charles but as the barbarian king of a barbarian people. Irene, even if a woman, was Augustus Cæsar, Autocrat of the Romans, and Charles was only the king of the Franks.³ The Roman Patriarch had finally

¹ De schism. Don. iii. 3.

² St. Ambrose (340-397) continually reckons the defeat of the legions as a victory of Satan over the cause of Christ (*e.g.*, de fide, xvi. 136, *seq.*). When his brother Satyrus died he said: “He was taken away lest he see the overthrow of the whole earth and the end of the world” (de excessu Sat. 30)—Gratian has just been killed. Dante’s *de Monarchia* is the classical apology for this position.

³ ῥήξ τῶν φράγκων. Ῥήξ is Rex. They would not call him βασιλεύς, because they called the Emperor so, and had come to look upon the word as equal to Imperator. Luitprand: *Legatio* in Pertz, *Mon. Germ.* III, p. 347. Here is an example of their feelings on this subject: they say to Luitprand, Archbishop of Cremona, who went on an embassy to Constantinople in 968: “But the mad

cut himself off from the Roman world. Seventy years later came the schism. Undoubtedly the rival Empire helped to foster ill-feeling. And, however much loyalty one feels as a Frank and a Latin to the long and splendid line of Western Emperors that lasted for just over a thousand years, from Charles the Great (800) to Francis I (1804), one must also sympathize with the feeling of the Court of Byzantium. After all, they had the direct line of continuity.

The culmination of these unfriendly relations was reached when the Crusaders sacked Constantinople in 1204, and set up a Frank as Emperor even there.¹ The Byzantines never forgot that outrage.

These were the chief causes of Eastern ill-feeling against Rome. Its results are seen long before the actual schism. Never was it shown more plainly than in 691 at the *Quinisextum*. The first four councils had drawn up, not only dogmatic decrees, but also Canons about Church discipline. There were no Canons of the 5th (553) and 6th (680). The Emperor Justinian II (685-695) thought that this omission should be made good. So in 692 he summoned a council to draw up Canons, as a supplement to the last two general synods. The bishops met under the same cupola in the Palace at Constantinople as the Synod of 680. So this council is called the second council in Trullo.² As it was intended to complete the fifth and sixth general councils it is also called Concilium Quinisextum (Σύννοδος πενθέκτη), the "Fifth-Sixth." There were 211 bishops present, all Easterns. But one Basil of Gortyna in Crete belonged to the Roman Patriarchate (Illyricum), and he called himself Papal Legate. There is no evidence of his having received any commission from Rome. The council drew up 102 Canons, no dogmatic definition. Many of these Canons only repeat, word for word, older laws; but most of the

and silly Pope does not know that St. Constantine transferred the Imperial sceptre, all the Senate and the whole Roman army hither, and that at Rome he left only vile creatures such as fishermen, pastrycooks, birdcatchers, bastards, plebeians, and slaves" (*op. c.* p. 358).

¹ See p. 225.

² Trullanum II; when the council in Trullo is mentioned alone without a number, this one (692) is generally meant.

new ones show open hostility to Rome. These bishops, claiming to form an œcumenical synod, want to make the whole Christian world conform to the uses of Constantinople. Everything the Armenians do that is not done by the Byzantines is condemned ;¹ but especially are all Latin customs anathematized. Latins fasted in those days on Saturday, so that is forbidden ;² they only receive fifty of the so-called Apostolic Canons, so Trullanum II insists on all eighty-five of them.³ Every little detail of difference is remembered to be condemned.⁴ Of course the old claim of the See of Constantinople to have "like honour" with Old Rome and Canon 3 of Constantinople, Canon 28 of Chalcedon are again brought forward.⁵ Pope Honorius is cheerfully condemned as a heretic.⁶ Marriage with a heretic is invalid, because Rome says it is only unlawful.⁷ But the most astonishing instance of the intolerance of the Greek bishops is their treatment of celibacy. In this point, as in the matter of fasting on Saturday, unleavened bread and so on, the Roman Church had never attempted to force her own customs on the Easterns. Each side had in these matters of discipline followed its own development without any breach of unity or friendship. The Latin Church had the law of celibacy for all her clerks in Holy Orders ; she had never complained of the laxer Eastern rule. But now these Easterns want to excommunicate us for our greater strictness. All clerks except bishops may continue in wedlock, and any one who tries to separate a priest or deacon from his wife, any clerk who leaves his wife because he is ordained, shall be excommunicate.⁸ We must remember that these bishops mean to legislate for the whole Church.⁹ Most astonishing of all is the fact that they then tried to get the Pope's signature to their Canons. Pope Sergius I (687-701) of course refused ; John VII (705-707) sent back the copy they wanted him to sign ;¹⁰ the place left at the head of the signatures for the Pope's name has always remained a blank. The Orthodox Eastern Church accepts this council

¹ Can. 32, 33, 56, 99.

² C. 55.

³ C. 2.

⁴ *E. gr.* c. 67, 82.

⁵ C. 36.

⁶ C. 1.

⁷ C. 72.

⁸ C. 3, 6, 12, 13, 48.

⁹ The whole story of the Quinisextum with its Canons is in Mansi, xi. 930, seq.

¹⁰ *Lib. Pont.* i, 385, 386.

as œcumenical, and adds its Canons to the decrees of the fifth and sixth councils. The West has always refused to acknowledge it. St. Bede calls it the reprobate synod, Paul the Deacon, erratic ;¹ it interests us here as an example of Eastern ill-feeling towards Rome and the Latins.

It was not the only example. When Maurus of Ravenna in 666 has the insolence to pretend to excommunicate his Patriarch (Pope Vitalian, 657-672), the Emperor Constans II (641-668) publishes a decree in support of the rebel, and affects to determine that the See of Ravenna shall in future always be independent of the Roman Patriarchate.² The Byzantines never cease making the most of Pope Honorius's case, till at last they persuade themselves that he, whose fault in any case only consisted in seeming to accept what their Patriarch, Sergius, had written, had been the original author and founder of the whole Monothelite heresy. From the time of his death in 638 till the sixth general council in 680 they admit the name of no Pope to their diptychs. In 649 Paul II of Constantinople (641-654) goes into the residence of the Roman Apocrisarius, sees a Latin altar there, and, in spite of the universal law by which an embassy is extra-territorial, has it overturned and destroyed.³

Lastly, long before the great schism broke out, the Byzantine bishops had become accustomed to a number of schisms against Rome, each of which was indeed eventually healed up, but each of which helped to weaken their sense of the need of union. The number of years during which the See of Constantinople was in schism from 323 to Photius's usurpation in 852, if added up, is a formidable one. This is the list : 55 years during the Arian troubles (343-398), 11 years because of St. John Chrysostom's deposition (404-415), 35 years during the Acacian schism (484-519, p. 84), 41 years because of Monothelitism (640-681), 61 years because of Iconoclasm (726-787). Altogether 203 years out of 529.⁴ And in every one of these cases Constanti-

¹ Bede : *de vi mundi ætate*, Paul Diac. : *Hist. Langob.* vi. p. 11. Intolerance of all other customs and the wish to make the whole Christian world conform to its own local practices has always been and still is a characteristic note of the Byzantine Church ; see pp. 153, 178, 191, 399, 436.

² *Monum. Germ. hist. Script.* Langob. pp. 350, 351.

³ Mansi, x, 880.

⁴ Duchesne : *Égl. sép.* p. 163.

nople was on the wrong or heretical side ; in every one Eastern and Western Christians now agree that Rome was right. Such continual breaches must gradually weaken the bond.

From all this then we see that, in spite of her acknowledgement of the Roman Primacy, the Byzantine Church, long before the schism, had entertained unfriendly feelings towards Latins ; when the schism did come, it happened because the time was only too ripe for it. The troubles of the 9th and the 11th centuries cut Christendom in half along a line that jealousies, misunderstandings, quarrels of all kinds had already long marked out.

Summary.

In this chapter we have considered the relations between Rome and the Eastern Churches. We have seen, first of all, that those Churches acknowledged the Primacy during the first eight centuries. The great Greek Fathers believed that St. Peter was the foundation of the Church, the chief of the Apostles, that he always lives and reigns in his successors the Bishops of Rome, that therefore the Roman See is the foundation of all sees, that her bishops are the chiefs of all bishops. This same conviction lasted through the Byzantine period (since Justinian, 527) till the schism. The Eastern Churches acknowledged the Pope as the highest judge and his see as the last court of appeal in their affairs too ; their bishops constantly used this right of appealing to Rome. The Pope's Primacy is confirmed by all the councils that Catholics and Orthodox agree in considering œcumenical, except by the two that were irregular in everything but the papal confirmation. On the other hand we have seen that there were causes of friction and ill-feeling between East and West long before the final schism broke out. Eastern Christians had never stood in quite so close a relation to the Pope as his own Latins. The ambition of Constantinople was a continual source of dispute, and the Popes were not always wise in their relations to the East. The ill-feeling is shown in many ways, chiefly at the Quinisextum Synod, and by the fact that the Byzantine Church had already been many times in schism before Photius.

CHAPTER III

THE FAITH AND RITES OF THE BYZANTINE CHURCH BEFORE THE SCHISM

To complete our picture of the first period we may in this chapter add some notes about the beliefs, rites, and customs of the other half of Christendom during the eight centuries in which they still formed one Church with our fathers. Eastern people are notoriously the most conservative of all, and so, except for the differences brought about by the schism, nearly all these things, even unimportant customs, have remained unchanged till to-day. It will be convenient to describe their liturgy more exactly when we come to our account of their present state. In this chapter a few general observations will be enough.

I. The Faith of the Byzantine Church.

We have already considered the great question—their belief in the Roman Primacy. Other points are much less in dispute and may be passed over more quickly. In the first place, inter-communion has always meant agreement in faith. The immediate result of a heresy being officially condemned was that every Catholic was bound to condemn it too; those who would not do so, heretics, at once broke off all relations with the Orthodox. So from the fact that there was communion between the Churches, that each in its liturgy prayed for the chief bishops of the others, we may certainly conclude that they agreed in faith.

The development of doctrine (for there was development from the very beginning) went on in parallel lines in East and West. It is true that the great Trinitarian and Christological heresies arose in the East, and that often for a time they seemed to swallow up great parts of those Churches. This produced a temporary schism ; but in every case the East at last rejected the heresy as the West had done ; some heretics remained separate from the great body of Christians, but between the main parts of the Church union was restored and the heresy was equally condemned by all. We have seen that Nestorianism and Monophysism produced the greatest and most lasting effects. Since the 5th century great bodies of Christians have remained separate from both Rome and Constantinople. The Nestorians use the Nicene Creed, accept the first two general councils, but, of course, reject the third (Ephesus, 431). Still greater schisms were caused by Monophysism. The Copts in Egypt, Jacobites in Syria, and the Armenian Church all look upon the Council of Chalcedon (451) as an abomination. We must then leave these bodies out of account. We have only to consider the faith of what we may call the Orthodox Eastern Churches, that is, those in communion with Constantinople and, until the 9th century, in communion with Rome.¹ Both East and West then used the same creeds. What we call the Apostles' Creed is a Roman baptismal form, but Eusebius of Cæsarea († c. 340), Marcellus of Ancyra († 372), St. Cyril of Jerusalem († 385) and other Eastern bishops drew up practically identical creeds.² The great test of Orthodoxy was the Nicene Creed, first drawn up at Nicæa, then modified considerably by the First Council of Constantinople. This creed was used officially by all Orthodox Churches, Eastern and Western.³ It is still recited in our liturgy and in theirs. It is, however, well known that the addition of a word to this creed in the West afterwards became and still is the chief charge made against us by the East. We shall come back to the question of

¹ That is, generally so in spite of a number of schisms, p. 96.

² Quoted in Denzinger, I, I, L, N, &c.

³ In Rome apparently only since the time of Justinian (527-565) ; Duchesne *Ég. sép.* p. 80.

the Filioque.¹ Meanwhile, till the 5th century, the creed was exactly the same everywhere. And when the Filioque was added to it, first in Spain, eventually in Rome, the Easterns did not trouble about it—no one ever asked them to adopt it—till Photius found in it a convenient grievance against the Latins.

About the foundations of the Christian faith, then, the worship of one God in the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation of God the Son, our redemption through his death, the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come, about these things there was not, there has never been any dispute.

The Easterns also agreed with us about the *Catholic Church*. That there may be Christians cut off from her communion was a fact as patent to them as to our fathers. We had Donatists and Priscillianists, they had many more schismatics outside their gates. But that in order to be a member of the Church of Christ one had to belong to the visible unity of the Church, this they knew as well as the Latins. In spite of passing schisms, in spite of all manner of unfriendly feeling, they never conceived the theory of a Church divided into mutually excommunicated bodies yet still mocked with the title of one.² *Dionysius of Alexandria* († 264) wrote to Novatian: "If you were unwillingly forced to do so (break away from communion with the rest of the Church), as you say, prove it by now willingly coming back. It would have been better to suffer anything rather than that the Church should be torn; nor would it have been less glorious to suffer even martyrdom rather than to tear the Church in pieces, than to suffer in order not to sacrifice to idols; indeed, in my opinion it would be even more glorious, for in the latter case one would suffer only for one's own soul, in the former for the whole Church."³ The Bishop of Alexandria then agrees with our *St. Augustine* († 430): "Nothing is worse than the sacrilege of schism, because there is no just reason for breaking the unity."⁴ But as long ago as the 3rd century schismatics made the same excuse that we still hear from their successors—they have returned to a more primitive faith; they find communion with

¹ P. 372.

² Nor do their descendants now, see p. 365.

³ The letter is quoted by Eusebius, H.E. vi. 45.

⁴ Ep. ad Parmen. ii. 11.

Rome impossible, because of her later corruptions. The followers of one Artemon (an obscure heretic of the 3rd century) "say that all the ancients and the Apostles received and taught just what they themselves teach, and that the true doctrine had been kept down to the time of Victor, who was the thirteenth Bishop of Rome after Peter, but that the truth has been corrupted since the time of his successor Zephyrinus."¹

After our long discussion about the order of the hierarchy we need hardly produce more texts to prove that in the East the Church was ruled and served by the ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Here, too, minor orders were founded later to give a share in the deacon's office to lesser clerks. Sub-deacons (first mentioned in the East by St. Athanasius, † 373)² as well as Readers, Exorcists,³ and Doorkeepers,⁴ were counted as having minor orders.

The fruits of Redemption were applied in the *Seven Great Mysteries*, our Sacraments. They do not seem to have been drawn up into a list till later (the "Orthodox Confession" of Peter Mogilas does so in 1640), but there is abundant evidence of their use in the Byzantine Church.⁵ A very long list of Eastern Fathers might be quoted to prove that they believed in the *Real Presence* and in the real and objective change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. *Macarius the Great*, an Egyptian monk († 390), wrote a sentence that is famous as condemning the Reformers of the 16th century 1,200 years before their time with a force of expression that we should now not allow ourselves: "He said: This is my Body; therefore the Eucharist is not the figure of his Body and Blood, as some have said, talking nonsense in their stupid minds, but it is in very truth the Blood and Body of Christ."⁶ St. Gregory of Nyssa,⁷ St. Cyril of

¹ Eusebius, H.E. v. 28.

² Hist. Arian. 60, M.P.G. xxv. 765.

³ Both mentioned by the Synod of Antioch in 341, Can. 10.

⁴ Syn. Laod. 370, Can. 24.

⁵ Pargoire: *Eglise byzantine*, pp. 93, 224, 336. They must have been tabulated long before 1640. At Lyons in 1274 the number seven was recognized by the Greeks.

⁶ M.P.G. x. 1374.

⁷ Or. Cat. M.P.G. xlv. 93, seq.

Jerusalem,¹ St. John Chrysostom,² St. Cyril of Alexandria,³ St. John Damascene,⁴ and indeed almost all the Greek Fathers speak of this mystery at length, use words that can only be translated by "Transubstantiation,"⁵ and say that after the words of consecration what is present is the very Body of Christ, that was born of the Virgin, scourged and crucified, the Blood that flowed from his side.⁶ The old liturgies express the same faith. As one example for all, in the *Coptic Liturgy* the priest says : "The Body and Blood of Emmanuel our God this is in truth.—Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, and I confess unto the last breath that this is the quickening flesh which thine only-begotten Son our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ took of the lady of us all the holy Mother of God, St. Mary."⁷ The Orthodox liturgies are equally plain.⁸

The East always exceeded the West in the ardour of the reverence it paid to the Blessed Virgin Mary and to the Saints, as also in the wealth of language with which it invoked them. The sober Roman mind never produced such ornate prayers to the Saints, or such enthusiastic praises of them as the great Greek Fathers.

Most of all Saints of course was the "All-holy Mother of God" the object of their devotion. Of all the generations that have called her blessed, none have done so with such eloquence as the Eastern Christians.⁹ And devotion to our Lady is still a special mark of all these Churches. It seems useless to bring quotations to prove what no one will deny.

The old liturgies, the sermons of the Fathers, are full of the

¹ Catech. Myst. 4, 20 ; M.P.G. xxxiii. 1098, 1123.

² Hom. 82 (al. 83) in Mt. Hom. 45 (46), 42, 17 ; M.P.G. lxi. 199 ; lxiii. 131, &c.

³ In Mt. xxvi. 27 ; M.P.G. lxxiii. 519.

⁴ De fide orth. M.P.G. xciv. 1146, seq.

⁵ μεταστοιχειῶσθαι, μεταβάλλεσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μετουσίωσις, κ.τ.λ.

⁶ In the texts referred to. Cf. Pesch : *Præl. dogm.* vi. prop. lxiv.

⁷ Brightman : *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 185.

⁸ Brightman, p. 387, the Epiklesis of St. John Chrysostom's liturgy : "Make this bread the precious Body of thy Christ," &c. ; p. 393, the Manual Acts : "The Lamb of God is broken and divided," &c. All the Epikleses are equally explicit.

⁹ Hurter : SS. PP. opuscula selecta, xii. and xxxiv. *de gloriosa Dei Genitrice Maria*.

Invocation of Saints in every century, back to the days when the Christians wrote prayers to their martyrs over their tombs in the catacombs. As one example from a Greek Father we may quote *St. Chrysostom's* sermon on SS. Berenice and Prosdoce : "Not only on this their feast, but on other days too, let us cling to them, pray to them, beg them to be our patrons. For not only living, but also dead they have great favour with God, indeed even greater favour now that they are dead. For now they bear the marks (stigmata) of Christ ; and by showing these marks there is nothing that they cannot obtain of the King." ¹

But the Byzantine Calendar contains some very astonishing names. It is well known that even far into the middle ages there was no regular process of canonization. Our present law, by which canonization takes place in Rome after a formal trial, was made by Urban VIII in 1634.² In earlier ages a sort of popular consent controlled by the bishop, who admitted the Saint's name to his local litany or martyrology, was enough. There are numberless instances of a person being honoured as a Saint in one place but not in another. It is therefore quite natural that the Byzantine Church should have her own Saints. She prayed first of all to those who belong to all Christendom, St. John the Baptist, the Apostles, St. Stephen, and so on ; she also admitted to her Calendar some of the greatest Roman Saints, St. Laurence, St. Gregory the Great, St. Martin, &c., just as we pray to St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. John Damascene. And then she had her own local Saints. It is these who astonish us. Never did the kingdom of heaven suffer violence as at Constantinople. Almost every Emperor who did not persecute the Church (and many who did), almost every patriarch who was not a heretic (and some who were) becomes a Saint. St. Constantine (May 21st) was in his life perhaps hardly a model to be followed, but then he was baptized on his death-bed, and baptism removes all stain of sin and guilt of punishment, St. Theodosius I (January 17th) was at any rate a great

¹ Hom. de SS. Berenice et Prosdoce, n. 7.

² Alexander III in 1170 had already forbidden any one to canonize a Saint without the consent of the Roman See. The decree is in our *Corpus Iuris*, in the *Decretals*, iii. 45, "de rel. et ven. SS." i. Audivimus.

man, St. Marcian (February 17th) had a very holy wife, St. Justinian (November 15th) deserves the credit of two immortal works, the Codex and the Church of the Holy Wisdom, but what can one say for St. Theodosius II (July 29th), St. Leo I, the Emperor (January 20th), St. Theodora, the public dancing woman who became an Empress, and was always a Monophysite (November 15th), St. Justinian II (July 15th), St. Constantine IV (September 3rd) ?

An even easier road to heaven is open to patriarchs, as long as they do not quarrel with Cæsar. St. Anatolius († 458, his feast is on July 3rd), we have heard of at Chalcedon (p. 36) ; he had been a Monophysite and Dioscur's legate at court, but he was a poet who wrote some of the earliest Greek Stichera. St. John IV the Faster († 599) deserves the gratitude of his successors for having left them the proud if ill-omened title of Œcumenical Patriarch. But not only he, every Patriarch of Constantinople from Epiphanius († 535) to Thomas I († 610) is a Saint, except only Anthimus I. It seems invidious to leave him out ; but then he was a Monophysite, deposed by Pope Agapitus in 536. From 669 to 712 again every patriarch is canonized with five exceptions, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, the four Monothelites condemned by the sixth general council (680), and John VI, the accomplice of the usurper Philip Bardesanes (711-713).¹ But the Byzantine Church has some more respectable Saints than these. There are numbers of Confessors, monks from every Laura,² and a great crowd of Martyrs, massacred by Saracens, or executed by Iconoclast Emperors.

That the Eastern Churches used and revered *Images* and *Relics* of Saints is also too well known to need proof. This custom also they had inherited from the catacombs. In all Eastern Churches the first thing that met a stranger's eye, then

¹ Philip was an Armenian soldier who murdered the Emperor Justinian II. After two years' reign he was deposed, and his eyes were put out by Anastasius II (713-716). The Patriarch John promptly implored forgiveness of the Pope and the Emperor ; he was allowed to be Patriarch till his death (715), but he had ruined his chance of being canonized.

² A Laura (λαύρα) is a Greek monastery.

as now, was the great Ikonostasis, the screen across the church shutting off the sanctuary and covered with pictures of Saints.¹ In the East as in the West the holy Sacrifice must be offered over the relics of Saints. The enormous number of relics at Constantinople made that city a place of pilgrimage second only to Rome or Jerusalem. It is true that during the Iconoclast persecutions (726-775 and 813-842) the great majority of the Byzantine hierarchy gave way and condemned the images as much as the Emperor could wish. But that only shows their servile fear of the tyrant. The same bishops came back at once to the old custom when the persecution ceased. It was a council composed almost entirely of Eastern bishops (Nicæa II, 787) that approved of reverence paid to holy images; the great leaders of the anti-Iconoclast side were all Greeks, St. Germanus of Constantinople, St. Theodore of Studium, St. John of Damascus. The Orthodox Eastern Church still keeps every year the memory of the day (February 19, 842) on which the images were finally brought back to the Cathedral at Constantinople.² The Iconoclast troubles, however, have left an interesting result to this day in the East. The old Greek idols were all statues, therefore there may be no statues in a church. There are hosts of pictures, painting, mosaic, even bass-relief, as long as the work is quite flat and shallow, but no statues (p. 129).

Three questions require some discussion, Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception and Predestination.

It has been disputed whether the Orthodox Eastern Church now agrees with the Catholic faith concerning *Purgatory*. That faith consists in these two articles only: 1. The souls of the just may after death still keep some stain of sin. 2. Such stain must then be expiated by punishment before they go into everlasting happiness. Whatever the modern Orthodox may think about these propositions,³ both were taught by the Eastern Church before the schism. The Greek Fathers, in the first place, all pray for the dead, a practice that supposes at any rate some sort of middle state after death. Saints in heaven do not

¹ *εικονόστασις* = Picture-stand.

² This is the "Feast of Orthodoxy" kept on the first Sunday of Lent.

³ See p. 388.

want our prayers, souls in hell cannot be helped by them. So *St. John Chrysostom* : "It was not in vain that the Apostles settled this by law, namely, that in the venerable and sacred mysteries we should remember the dead. For they knew that the dead have much profit and advantage therefrom. At the moment when all the people stand around, their hands lifted up, and the company of priests as well, and when that Sacred Victim is offered, how should we not appease God for them by our prayers?"¹ So also the *Apostolic Constitutions* : "Let us pray for our brothers who rest in Christ, that the merciful God who has received the souls of the dead, may forgive all their sins and may graciously admit them to the land of the just."² Equally explicit are *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*,³ his namesake at Alexandria,⁴ *St. Epiphanius*,⁵ &c. But they speak of the fire of purgatory as well. *St. Basil* does so in several places. "If we reveal our sin in confession, we make it like dry grass which is fit to be burnt away by the cleansing fire . . . but, if it does not become like dry grass, it will not be devoured and burnt up by the fire."⁶ He describes hell, and then says there is "a place fit to cleanse the soul."⁷ He certainly distinguishes the fire of purgatory from that of hell, but his obvious allusions to 1 Cor. iii. 15 make it difficult to know whether he does not conceive the fire of purgatory to be that of the Last Day. This is the case with other Fathers, both Eastern and Western. At any rate there is no doubt about the principle : there is a pain by which those are cleansed who are eventually saved. "Some shall be saved yet so as by fire." This is the essence of the doctrine of Purgatory. *St. Gregory of Nyssa* says of the soul of a dead man : "It will be brought before the judgement-seat, it will hear the sentence on its past life, it will receive punishment and reward according to its desert, either to be cleansed by fire according to the words of the Gospel or to be blessed

¹ In Phil. hom. 3, 4. M.P.G. lxii. 204.

² Const. Apost. viii. 41. M.P.G. i. 1143.

³ Cat. Myst. v. 9. M.P.G. xxxiii. 1115.

⁴ M.P.G. lxxvi. 1423.

⁵ Hær. lxxv. 3, 7, 8. M.P.G. xlii. 514, seq.

⁶ M.P.G. xxx. 519. This fire is certainly a purgatorial one, since it is to be desired that it should burn away our sins.

⁷ In Is. v. 14. M.P.G. xxx. 435.

and comforted in the dew of grace.”¹ A fire that cleanses, one may urge, is not the fire of hell. On the other hand, it is true that we do not find such a clear or definite conception of purgatory in these Fathers of the 4th century as in our modern catechisms. The essence of the belief is there—a middle state after death in which souls are helped by our prayers; out of this the Church gradually realized more and more clearly what she was to deduce. It is again an example of development. It seems that the Eastern Church has remained in a vaguer state of mind about this point. But there has been no serious disagreement in the past. At the Council of Florence (1439) the Greeks objected to a material fire in purgatory. They were assured that the Latin Church does not define that either and then declared themselves in agreement with the doctrine.²

The *Immaculate Conception* of the Blessed Virgin was the subject of much discussion between the Scotist and Thomist schools during the middle ages in the West. It was not finally defined by the Pope till 1854. We can certainly not claim that it had been defined earlier by the Easterns. But it is to be noted that the devotion which culminated in that definition came to us from the East. All the Eastern Churches, orthodox or heretical, keep the feast of our Lady's Conception.³ It is first mentioned by Eastern theologians (St. Andrew of Crete in 675, St. John Damascene, † 744, St. Theodore of Studium, † 826, and others), whereas we hear of it in the West much later, in the 11th century.⁴ By keeping its feast then, as distinct from our Lady's birthday on Sept. 8th, these Churches imply that her conception itself is holy and worshipful. But a conception in original sin, which makes a man a child of wrath, whose stain is only removed afterwards, is not to be honoured

¹ M.P.G. xlv. 167.

² For the whole question see Pesch: *Præl. dogm.* ix. p. 285. Hergenröther: *Photius*, iii. pp. 643–652. Loch: *Das Dogma der griechischen Kirche vom Purgatorium* (Regensburg, 1842).

³ Dec. 9. “The child-begetting of the mother of the Mother of God, Anne.” This feast is kept by Melkites, Albanians, Jacobites, Copts, Armenians, Nestorians, Maronites, and all Churches in communion with Constantinople.

⁴ It is supposed to have been introduced by St. Anselm of Canterbury († 1109).

by a feast.¹ Moreover, there are Eastern Fathers who imply the Immaculate Conception plainly enough, joining our Lord and his Mother together as the only two who were all stainless. So *St. Ephrem* († c. 379) addresses our Lord : " You indeed and your Mother are the only ones who are beautiful in every way ; for in you, O Lord, there is no spot, in your Mother no stain." ² The *Acts of St. Andrew* say : " As the first man was formed from immaculate earth (that is, from the earth before it was cursed by God, Gen. iii. 17), who by the sin of the tree brought death into the world, it was necessary that the perfect man, the Son of God, should be born of an Immaculate Virgin." ³ The development of this dogma, then, went on in parallel lines in both Churches before the schism. It is to be noticed that it did so equally after the schism ; the Eastern theologians, never behindhand in giving honour to the all-holy Theotokos, taught her Immaculate Conception more and more plainly, till the influence of Protestants produced an opposing school, and at last the fact that the Pope defined the doctrine was a sufficient reason for altogether denying it (p. 391).

The question of *Grace and Predestination* is interesting as showing the different attitude of mind in the two Churches. Although Pelagius was condemned at Ephesus side by side with Nestorius,⁴ this question never took hold of Eastern minds as it did those of the Latins. Their theological discussions were all Christological, ours Soteriological. St. Augustine, whose influence in the West has always been so great, remained almost unknown in the East, and their schools never produced any one like St. Augustine. Harnack thinks that the Greek Church is

¹ St. Augustine's sermon on St. Cyprian : " We should not keep his birthday even if we knew the date, because on that day he contracted original sin " (Sermon 310, n. 1). The Church only keeps three birthdays—of our Lord, our Lady, and St. John the Baptist, because he, too, was sanctified before his birth.

² Carm. Nisibena, ed. Bickell, p. 122.

³ M.P.G. xi. 1226. The point of the comparison is that Adam was made from the earth as yet unstained by the curse of original sin—so also Christ. For this question see Hurter : *Theol. dogm. comp.* iii. pp. 464-479. Pesch : *Præl. dogm.* iii. pp. 160-172.

⁴ Can. i. 4.

just a school of Greek philosophy overlain with a thin veneer of the Gospel, and the Roman Church is the Roman Empire with the same veneer.¹ We may, perhaps, say that the Greek philosophical mind found the questions of Christology—of nature and person, unity and distinction—congenial, while the Latin mind, that had built up the legal system of the Empire, was naturally attracted to legal questions, such as those of predestination. In any case, the subtle system explained by St. Augustine in his *de Dono perseverantiæ* and *de Prædestinatione sanctorum*, the great field of discussion that he left to his Church, the endless controversy that has gone on amongst us ever since about the fine line between antecedent reprobation on the one hand and semi-Pelagianism on the other—all these things have never troubled Easterns at all. As always happens to people who have not gone far into the matter, they rather inclined to the opposite of St. Augustine's system, to loose and kindly principles which, if driven out of their vagueness, would become semi-Pelagian. St. John Chrysostom is an example of this. He did not intend to formally discuss the matter, he had never heard of Pelagianism, and was concerned to defend free will against Manichæism. He does in many places maintain the need of grace for every good deed,² but he also, inconsistently, in other places uses such expressions as "We must first choose what is right, and then God will do his part,"³ expressions that would be inconceivable in Augustine. This want of definiteness about Grace and Predestination has always been a note of the Eastern Church. Long after the schism, in 1575, when the Tübingen Protestants sent an exposition of their belief to Jeremias II of Constantinople (1572-1579), the Patriarch in his answer to their Calvinism teaches pure semi-Pelagianism.⁴ Lastly, Mgr. Duchesne sees a different attitude of mind between the two Churches in the 3rd and 4th centuries even about the

¹ *Wesen des Christentums*, ii. 3, 4.

² Hom. in Mt. lxix. 2. M.P.G. lxxviii. 2. In Mt. xxxix. 4. M.P.G. lvii. 438 In Eph. 2. M.P.G. lxii. 33, seq.

³ Hom. xii. in Hebr. M.P.G. lxiii. 99. See also Hom. xlii. in Gen. i. M.P.G. liv. 385.

⁴ *Acta theolog. Vitenb. et Hier. Pt. i.* 143. (See p. 253.)

mystery of the *Holy Trinity*. They agreed, of course, entirely in the definition, in the worship of one God in three Persons ; but it often happens that people see things, especially mysteries, from different angles. The Western Fathers, he thinks, start from the consubstantial nature, from the Unity of God, and they subordinate to it the mystery of the three Persons ; the Easterns first consider the three Persons, each truly God, and then add to this consideration the mystery that they are nevertheless one God. He goes on to notice how this representation comes from Origen, how it reached the great Greek Fathers through semi-Arian channels, and he sees in it a reason even for the later quarrel about the Filioque. "The faith unites," he says, "but theology sometimes divides us. St. Augustine in his theory of the Trinity, in his philosophic conception of the mystery, is very far from St. Gregory of Nazianzum."¹

The most general observation of all would be, perhaps, that Eastern theology seems to us vague. They have had no lack of subtle philosophers before the schism and after it ;² but they do not seem to have ever felt that need of tabulating their articles of faith, of arranging them into a clear and consistent system, that has been a characteristic of the Western mind.³ Dr. Ehrhard says that the Greek Church has not had a mediæval period.⁴ She has certainly not had a scholastic period, nor any one like St. Thomas Aquinas. The perfection of system in his two *Summæ*, that has always remained the ideal of our theology since, has never been an ideal to them.⁵ One

¹ Duchesne : *Églises séparées*, pp. 83-87.

² To discuss theology has always been the delight of Greeks of every rank. It was the theological Emperors who caused the endless troubles of the Church from Constantius (337-361) to the schism. At the other end of the social scale "the city is full of workmen and slaves who are all theologians," says St. Gregory of Nyssa († c. 395), "if you ask a man to change money, he will tell you how the Son differs from the Father ; if you ask the price of a loaf he will argue that the Son is less than the Father ; you want to know if the bath be ready and you are told that the Son was made out of nothing."

³ An example of this is their confusion about the meaning of the words *οὐσία*, *ὑπόστασις*, *πρόσωπον*. Cf. Franzelin, *de Verbo incarn.* Th. 21.

⁴ *Der Kathol. u. d. xx Jhrt.* (1902), p. 23.

⁵ The *Summa* theol. was first done into Greek by Demetrios Kydones in the 14th century.

can realize that a tradition of theology, that is influenced neither by St. Augustine nor, later, by St. Thomas, must be in many ways very different from ours. One notices this difference most plainly in modern times, but it existed already in the time before the schism. Our Fathers had no St. Thomas then, but they had the tendencies that would afterwards give his work such enormous importance.

The faith of the Orthodox Eastern Church, then, during the first eight centuries was the same as that of Rome, although naturally the difference of race and of theological traditions (since they could not understand our Fathers) gradually formed a different system of philosophy and a different way of looking at certain articles of faith. But these differences did no sort of harm to the unity of faith.

2. Eastern Liturgies.¹

After the faith come rites. Here there is a real difference. None of the Eastern Churches ever knew anything of our Roman Liturgy. In this matter the different Churches followed their own traditions from the very beginning. There has never been a parent-rite from which the later ones were derived.

The Apostles left only in the most general way the practice of meeting together for prayer, for reading the Scriptures, for singing psalms, and especially for the Breaking of Bread. This was, of course, the chief thing. As our Lord had commanded, the first Christians met together to do what he had done at the Last Supper, in memory of him. The story of that Supper in the New Testament gave the general outline of the rite. They did what he had done. They took bread and wine, gave thanks, broke, said again his own words, and then received the Blessed Sacrament in Communion. They certainly also said prayers and read parts of the Bible. This office gradually crystallized into the liturgy, and it crystallized into

¹ The word Liturgy in classical Greek means a public work (*λεῖτον ἔργον*, *leitourgēin*, to perform a public service). The LXX and N.T. (Luke i. 23 ; Heb. ix. 21) use it for the temple service. In the East of Europe Liturgy means only the service of consecrating the Holy Eucharist, *i.e.*, exactly the same as our word Mass.

different liturgies in different places. Nor did any one feel any need of uniformity in rites. The faith was the same everywhere, and the essence of the liturgy was the same. For the rest, for the particular ceremonies that grew up, the prayers, and the language used, each Church was content to let the others follow their own customs.

And the Church of Rome was no exception. When her own use was at last definitely formed, she never thought of imposing it on sister-Churches in the East. It is true that the Roman rite at last became almost the only one used throughout the West ; that is the result of the very close union of all Western Churches in her patriarchate. But the Eastern Churches before the schism, the Uniate Churches now, keep their own liturgies without challenge. In modern times the Popes have repeatedly ordered that these Eastern uses shall be respected, they forbid any priest to leave his own rite in order to use ours.¹ These rites have changed very little since they were first formed. We may leave a more exact description of the actual service till we come to the Byzantine Church in modern times (p. 412) and now only trace the rise and spread of the chief liturgies.

During the first three centuries we have only a few allusions to the liturgy, too vague, or, if quotations, too short for us to be able to reconstruct the service from them. Three such allusions are famous. The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (about the end of the 1st century) tells Christians "to come together on the Lord's Day, to break bread and give thanks, having confessed your sins, that your sacrifice be pure."² To "give thanks" (εὐχαριστεῖν) is already the technical word for, as we still say, the Eucharist. It also tells how to celebrate this service : "Concerning the Thanksgiving (Eucharist), you shall thus give thanks. First over the cup : We give thee thanks, our Father, for the holy vine of thy son David, which thou hast shewn us by thy son Jesus ; glory be to thee for ever. And over the broken

¹ So various constitutions of Clement VIII (1592-1605), Paul V (1605-1621), Benedict XIII (1724-1730), Benedict XIV (1740-1758), and the Constitution *Orientalium dignitas Ecclesiarum* of Leo XIII on November 30, 1894.

² Doctrina XII Apost. xiv. 1.

(bread) : We give thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast shown us by thy son Jesus ; glory be to thee for ever. As this broken (bread) was scattered over the mountains¹ and is now joined together and made one, so may thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth to thy kingdom ; for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. But no one may eat or drink of your thanksgiving, except those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord, for about this the Lord said : Do not give the holy thing to dogs.”²

St. Clement of Rome († 104) quotes a very beautiful prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, ending in a doxology, which, although it contains no allusion to the Holy Eucharist, has always been supposed to be an early liturgical prayer.³ *St. Justin Martyr* († 166) gives in his first Apology a much more detailed account of what Christians do on “the day of the Sun.” They kiss each other and pray. “Then to him who presides over the brethren bread is brought and a cup of water and wine, and he receives them and gives praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and Holy Ghost and performs the Eucharist.” *St. Justin* then describes how the deacons give people Holy Communion. He says, “This food we call the Eucharist . . . for we do not receive it as common bread nor as common wine ; but, just as by the word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made man, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we are taught that the food made a Eucharist by his prayer of thanksgiving, by which our blood and flesh are nourished, is the body and blood of Jesus made man.” He then quotes our Lord’s words at the Last Supper, and adds an interesting note : “And the wicked demons have imitated this, teaching it to be done in the mysteries of Mithra. For you know, or may learn, that bread and a cup of water are brought with certain words in the mysteries of the initiated.”⁴

¹ When it was growing as corn. The idea is that, just as the grains of corn are gathered together from all parts and kneaded into bread, so may Christians from all lands become one in the kingdom of God.

² Doctr. XII Ap. ix.

³ Clem. Rom. I, ad Cor. lix.-lxi.

⁴ Iustini Apologia, I 65, 66.

It is in the 4th century that we find definitely constructed liturgies. By that time four types have evolved, that are the parents from which all others have since been derived. These four uses are the *Roman, Gallican, Egyptian, and Syrian*.¹ These last two are the original Eastern liturgies.

The story of their development is very like that of the patriarchates that used them. In the first period the rites of the two greatest Eastern sees, Alexandria and Antioch, divide the allegiance of the East; then Constantinople evolves a rite of her own, and this rite gradually drives out the older ones, and becomes practically the only one used by the Orthodox Churches. But the heretics in Egypt and Syria keep the older liturgies.

3. The Syrian Rite.

This is the first that we find formally drawn up. The *Apostolic Constitutions* contain a liturgy that is evidently a form of the one we find soon after used all over Syria. The *Apostolic Constitutions* are a collection of eight books, purporting to be drawn up by the twelve Apostles, really put together from different sources in Syria in the beginning of the 5th century.² The first six books are an enlargement of another apocryphal work, the *Didascalia*,³ the seventh of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,⁴ the eighth book contains the liturgy, then follow the eighty-five apocryphal "Canons of the Apostles" that were accepted by the Quinisextum in 692.⁵ Two circumstances about the liturgy have led people to suppose that it is the oldest we have: First, it contains no Memory of the Saints, no names are mentioned, not even that

¹ Mgr. Duchesne thinks that these four may be reduced to two. The Gallican use is derived from the Syrian, and the Egyptian one may be taken from Rome. *Origines du Culte chrétien*, p. 54.

² Epiphanius († 403) quotes them.

³ Discovered in a Syriac version in 1854.

⁴ This is the famous Didache (διδάχη τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων) found by Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, in 1883.

⁵ Ed. princ. by Fr. Turrianus, Venice, 1563. Cf. Funk, *Die Apost. Konstitutionen* (Rottenburg, 1891), and Bardenhewer's *Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1894), pp. 28-31.

of the Blessed Virgin ; secondly, it has no Our Father. These two omissions are unique. How far they prove greater antiquity is another question. Undoubtedly after the Council of Ephesus (431) a greater devotion to the holy Mother of God spread throughout the Orthodox Churches, and the invocation of her under this title was a protestation of orthodoxy. But prayers have been added to liturgies continually, and the very oldest now contain later additions, so that a use that has a Memory of Saints, even of late Saints, may be an old one to which this addition was made afterwards. The omission of the Our Father is curious, but proves nothing at all. Christians are told to use it "as the Lord commanded in his Gospel," three times a day, in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Indeed the perpetually fluid state of a liturgy in use makes it impossible to fix its date. They all gradually evolved and became fixed from what were at first extemporary prayers, and after having been written down they still received additions and modifications.¹

Goar and Renaudot thought that this liturgy had never been in actual use anywhere. On the other hand Probst² and Bickell³ think it was used even in the West during the first three centuries. Connected with this use is the *Liturgy of St. James*, the original rite from which all the other Syrian ones were derived. It still exists in Greek.⁴ It was probably first used in Jerusalem, since it alone contains a reference to that city. The "Intercession," immediately after the prayer of Consecration, begins : "We offer this to thee, O Lord, for thy holy places, which thou hast glorified by the appearance of thy Christ, and by the coming of thy Holy Ghost, chiefly for the holy and glorious Sion, the mother of all Churches, and then for thy holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout the world."⁵ As its name says, it was believed to have been composed by St. James the Less, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and from that city it spread throughout Syria. The order of

¹ The text of the liturgy in the Apost. Const. is given by Brightman, *op. cit.* pp. 2-30.

² *Liturgie der ersten 3 Jhrhten* (Tübingen, 1870), § 86.

³ Kraus : *Realenz.* ii. p. 310.

⁴ Brightman, pp. 31-68.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 54.

this liturgy is roughly as follows : first the Mass of the Catechumens, consisting of prayers, unrhythmical hymns, and readings from the Old and New Testaments (corresponding to our Mass to the end of the Gospel). Then follows the Mass of the Faithful : the bread and wine are solemnly brought to the altar, the Nicene Creed is said, then follow the Kiss of Peace and the "Anaphora," that is, the Consecration prayer, beginning "The Lord be with you," "Lift up your hearts," "It is truly meet and just," &c., as our Preface. The long prayer contains the words of Institution : "Take, eat, this is my Body broken for you and given for the remission of sins," and "Drink of this all ; this is my Blood of the New Testament, shed for you and for many and given for the remission of sins." These words are said aloud, and each time the people answer Amen. Then comes the Invocation (*Ἐπίκλησις*), a prayer that God may send the Holy Ghost to change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood of his Son, some more prayers, the reading of the Diptychs containing the names of people to be prayed for, the Memory of the Saints (our Communicantes), the Our Father, a sort of Elevation with the words "Sancta Sanctis" (*τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*), the breaking of the Host of which a part is put into the chalice, the communion of priest and people (always under both kinds), then a prayer of thanksgiving and the blessing and dismissal of the people. That is in general terms the order of the liturgy in Syria in the 5th century. At first there was no special liturgical language. Greek was used where the people understood it best, that is, in Antioch and probably the other chief towns, and Syriac in the country where the people spoke nothing else. Then came the great Monophysite schism after Chalcedon, and each language became a distinctive mark of one of the two sides. The Melkites used Greek,¹ the Jacobites Syriac. But as the Melkite Patriarchate gradually became more and more dependent on Constantinople, it began to use the Byzantine rite, till at last the Greek Liturgy of St. James almost entirely disappeared (p. 395). But the Jacobites always kept their Syrian Liturgy of St. James and evolved out of it with slight changes a number of daughter-rites.

¹ There was, however, a Melkite Liturgy in Syriac.

4. The Egyptian Rite.

Here exactly the same development took place. The original rite of the Church of Egypt is the *Liturgy of St. Mark*. The manuscripts that exist of it are much later than those of the Syrian Liturgy, and show it only after the Monophysite schism and after both Melkites and Copts have added to and otherwise modified it. But by noticing what is common to all the liturgies that grew out of it, one can form a fairly clear idea of the original service of about the 4th century, before the divisions came. That liturgy follows in general the same construction as the Syrian one. The chief difference is this. All liturgies have a great supplication for people of every class, living and dead, together with a Memory of the Saints by name. Our Roman rite has now for some reason got its Memory of Saints and Supplication divided; some of it comes before and the rest after the Consecration ("Te igitur, Memento vivorum, Communicantes"; then the Consecration; then "Memento defunctorum, Nobis quoque peccatoribus," with a second list of Saints).¹

The Syrian rite has it all after the Consecration; but in Egypt it all came before, between the "Vere dignum et iustum est" and the Sanctus, in the middle of what we should call the Preface;² so their Preface is much longer and their Consecration comes at a much later point in the Mass than in Syria or at Rome. For the rest, the Liturgy of St. Mark (which, of course, was really no more composed by him than the Syrian one by St. James) is divided into the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful, has an Epiklesis, the words of Institution said aloud and communion under both kinds, just

¹ The order in which our Canon now stands is a great problem. Cf. P. Drews: *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (Tübingen, 1902). He connects it with the Syrian Liturgy and thinks it was turned right round and the second half put first in the time of Gelasius I (492-496).

² It must be remembered that, although our missals now have the words "Canon Missæ" printed after the Preface, from the beginning of the Preface to the end of the "Libera nos, quæsumus, Domine," is all one long prayer, the Eucharistic prayer, of which then the Preface is a part.

as that of St. James and indeed all Eastern uses. But the actual prayers are different. One of the petitions in its Supplication is : "Draw up the waters of the river to their proper measure ; gladden and renew the face of the earth in their rising."¹ This is, of course, the yearly rising of the Nile. At first Greek or Coptic were used indiscriminately ; then the Melkites kept to Greek and the Copts to their own language.² The Copts evolved a number of liturgies out of the old one. Since the 12th century the Melkites use the Byzantine Liturgy.

5. The Byzantine Rite.

The Church of Constantinople had a liturgy of her own attributed to *St. Basil* († 379). It seems to be a modification of the Syrian rite. Later it was much shortened by *St. John Chrysostom* († 407), and this shorter form was the one commonly used, though on a few days in the year that of St. Basil was kept ; for the Mass of the Presanctified, which we have only on Good Friday, but which they celebrate every day in Lent, except Saturdays and Sundays, they use the *Liturgy of St. Gregory Dialogos* (our St. Gregory the Great, to whom they attribute it). These three liturgies make up the use of Constantinople, which spread throughout the Orthodox East as the Church for which it was composed became the head of all the others. It is now celebrated almost exclusively in a number of languages throughout the Orthodox Churches, and is, after our Roman Liturgy, by far the most widely spread of all (p. 397). The *Armenian Liturgy* is modified from that of Constantinople. Lastly, ever since the Nestorian schism there has been a group of *Nestorian Liturgies* in Syriac, used by that Church. In the Byzantine Church, then, the three liturgies it used were to the people as obvious and necessary a way of celebrating the Holy Mysteries as at the same time the Roman Mass was at Rome. The rite they saw most often was that of St. John Chrysostom. It was accompanied by a great deal of ritual, and said in gorgeous vestments, but in great part

¹ Brightman, p. 127.

² Greek St. Mark in Brightman, pp. 113-143 ; Coptic St. Mark, pp. 144-188.

behind the screen that cut off the sanctuary from the church. The preliminary prayers (before the "Little Entry") had not yet been added to it; otherwise hardly anything has changed since, so that any Orthodox church to-day will show almost exactly the same vestments, ceremonies and rites as those that Justinian knew (p. 412). Besides the liturgy in every church the Divine Office (p. 418) was sung daily.

6. Byzantine Piety and Morals.

Pilgrimages to the tombs of saints, famous sanctuaries, most of all to the holy places of Palestine, were very popular. There were a great number of *Sacramentals*. The sign of the Cross is used by every one continually. At Constantinople was a large piece of the true Cross on which people swore to keep their engagements, and they wore relics of it in little cross-shaped reliquaries of gold or silver round their necks. Holy water was blessed on the Epiphany (the Feast of our Lord's baptism)¹ and used for sprinkling houses, ships, and anything that was to be blessed. Water was poured into a chalice and then out again, and became holy water; even water used by any specially holy monk for washing was kept as sacred.² Oil taken from lamps that burned before sacred pictures and relics was used as a Sacramental; so also the holy bread (*Ἀντιδωρον*) broken off from the host before consecration and given to the people who did not receive Holy Communion. A favourite devotion was the *Metanoia* (*Μετάνοια*, repentance). It consists in prostrating oneself till the forehead touches the ground, while the weight of the body rests on the feet and hands; this was repeated a great number of times, and each time the penitent said, "Kyrie eleison," or some such formula.³

¹ On the Epiphany both East and West keep the memory of three things—the coming of the Wise Men, our Lord's baptism, His first miracle. The first of these things has become the most important to us, the second to them.

² All Eastern people, especially Mohammedans, follow this unclean custom. In the days of the Mahdi in the Sudan his followers drank the water in which he had washed as a protection against sickness. Cf. Ohrwalder: *Ten Years in the Mahdi's Camp* (1895), p. 182.

³ This also is a common practice among Eastern people of every religion. Every one knows how much Mohammedans use it.

The *Eulogion* was a holy gift, any small object given by a holy man and kept as a sort of Sacramental. Besides the Sacrament of Penance, it was considered a pious practice to confess one's sins to any virtuous person, chiefly to a monk, who was not a priest and could therefore not give absolution. The extreme punishment that the Church could inflict on her children was *excommunication*. All heretics and schismatics were *ipso facto* excommunicate. Any ecclesiastical intercourse with them involved the same punishment; to sign their formulas, receive any sacrament from them, sing psalms in their company, even to dine with them, or to have any civil relations, beyond what was absolutely necessary, involved excommunication. One may not accept their gifts to churches, nor pray for them publicly, nor say Mass for them after their death.¹ Even after they are converted back to orthodoxy, some of the stigma of their former heresy clings to them. Priests may not celebrate the liturgy, at any rate until they have done a long penance; if an orthodox Christian dines with a converted heretic, the convert may not say grace.

Meanwhile the great *popular feasts*, most of which have come down from pagan days—the Carnival, the feast of Spring in May, the Brumalia in November, &c.—are the occasion of every sort of licence; *magic* flourishes, and strolling magicians make fortunes by curing diseases, finding riches, and making women beautiful. The Court continually becomes a hotbed of unnameable vice.² Byzantine society during all the middle ages, from Constantine (330) till the city fell (1453), was by far the richest, most splendid, and most comfortable in Europe. It was also an old society, long established,³ and, at any rate comparatively, secure. These circumstances generally make for luxury, and then for vice. But it was not wholly bad. The Moslems first attacked the legions in 634, two years after Mohammed's death; from that

¹ To offer the holy liturgy for the repose of a person's soul was a universal custom long before the Byzantine period. The Apost. Const. determine that it shall be done on the third, ninth, fortieth and anniversary days after death.

² Cf. Pargoire, *op. cit.* pp. 319, *seq.*, 344, 348, 350, *seq.*

time they never ceased making war on the Empire ; they came to the gates of Constantinople in 673, and again in 716, but they did not succeed in taking the city till 1453. A State that could keep such fierce enemies, first the Saracens and then the Turks, at bay for eight centuries could not have been altogether corrupt. And there was repeatedly a revival at the Roman Court. After a time of utter corruption and decay, some strong man would get hold of the power and would sternly reform everything. Then the legions would again go forth and drive the barbarians back from the provinces they had taken.

In the long list of Emperors, from Constantine I to Constantine XII, there is a fair proportion of great names : some of them were very great indeed. Justinian I (527-565) was one of the greatest men that ever ruled anywhere. While he was drawing up the Code of Roman Law, that has been the standard for almost all the States of Europe ever since, while he was building the most wonderful church that the world has ever seen, his legions were defeating the Persians and driving the barbarian out of Italy, Spain, and Africa, till once more Cæsar ruled from the Pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates, and from the Danube to the African desert. Heraclius (610-641) finally broke the power of the old enemy of Rome, the " Great King " of Persia ; Leo III, the Isaurian (717-740), met the first rush of the Saracens, and first stopped their victorious career by driving them back from the walls of his own city ; Basil II, the Slayer of the Bulgars (963-1025), shattered the power of other barbarians, who threatened to overrun the Empire, and once more carried the Eagles back to the Danube. Most of these Emperors interfered in theological discussions, and persecuted the Church with their edicts ; but they were very valiant men and mighty lords, who again joined to the Roman name the terror of the Roman arms. Indeed no State could hold out for ever against the endless hordes of enemies that one after another came pouring up against the frontiers of the Empire. That it withstood them for so many centuries ; that it was the leader of Europe in civilization, while it was its bulwark against the common enemy for so long, gives New Rome a right to be remembered as one of the very greatest States in history.

7. Byzantine Art.

The manner of building and painting, the tradition of jewellery, metal work and decoration that we call *Byzantine*, are so closely connected with the history and liturgy of the Orthodox Eastern Church, that we ought not to pass them over here without some notice. The Byzantine question is one of those that are most disputed by archæologists. When the Romans had come under the influence of Greece, they, or their Greek artists, covered the Empire with the buildings and statues that we call Roman-Greek. This manner lasted without much development till about the end of the 3rd century. As far as Christians during this time were able to practise the fine arts, they naturally followed the tradition of their time. The catacomb paintings obviously belong to the same school as those of Pompeii. They are, of course, poorer and rougher, because they are the work of a poor and persecuted community that could not afford the service of any great artist. About the time of Diocletian (284-305) a new influence crosses this Roman-Greek school. For centuries there had been an *Asiatic* manner quite distinct from Greek work. It had come down from an almost fabulous age. The temple that Solomon had made Phœnicians build for him, the city of Ninive, the palace where Daniel stood before Nabuchodonosor, were built in it. The Persians had learnt it from the Babylonians, the Seleucid kings from the Persians. In the North of Syria there still stand a number of cities built in the Asiatic style, though already under Greek influence. Palmyra and Baalbek are the best known examples. They have arches and cupolas set on a square. Diocletian went to live at Asia for a time, and he brought back a taste for Asiatic architecture that still may be seen in his palace in Dalmatia. It is the crossing of these two traditions, Roman-Greek and Asiatic, that produced what we call Byzantine art. Just as they began to be combined two events happened that gave to the new style a sudden importance. Constantinople was built and the Christians, at last set free, began to cover the Empire with churches. Both the new city and the new religion naturally used the manner of building that was then in vogue. Of course no one was

conscious of founding a new style. Architecture, like every other art, has followed a natural and gradual development from the beginning, at any rate till the Renaissance. First one improvement was added, then another ; and it is only long afterwards that people, seeing their buildings, can mark changes sufficiently important to warrant a new name. Generally the change is so gradual that no one can say exactly when it took place. But in this case the city of Constantine and the Churches appear at such a definite moment of the evolution and themselves help so much to mark and spread the new movement, that nowhere in the history of architecture before the Renaissance can one draw so clear a line as between the old Roman-Greek and the new Byzantine styles. And no style is so well named as this last. The buildings of Byzantium are its classical examples, and represent its highest perfection. It has always been the artistic expression of the Churches that obey the Byzantine Patriarch, or were founded by him, and it still exists, being the only real and unconscious artistic tradition in Europe, in the Byzantine monasteries. The Byzantine question is only whether it really spread over Southern Europe from Constantinople, or whether the same influences, working in parallel lines, produced the same effect independently. In Italy and Southern France, at Rome, especially at Ravenna, are buildings, carving, most of all mosaics, that obviously belong to the same school as those in Constantinople, Illyricum, and Asia Minor. It used to be supposed that these were the work of Greek artists sent from the Bosphorus, and the fact that the best examples of such work are found in Ravenna, which had most connection with Constantinople (since the Emperor's Exarch sat there), was looked upon as proof. It was in this sense that people used to call the Ravenna mosaics Byzantine. But now the other theory has come to the fore. It is urged that much of the work at Ravenna was done while the Goth ruled there, before Belisarius conquered it back for the Emperor (540),¹ and

¹ The "Orthodox Baptistery" (S. Ioannes in Fonte) was built and decorated about 430, the tomb of Gallia Placidia about 450, St. Apollinaris the New and the Arian Baptistery (S. Maria in Cosmedin) by Theodoric (493-526), St. Vitalis, in which are the portraits of Justinian and Theodora, in 547 by the Bishop

that Theodoric was not likely to have sent to Constantinople for workmen. As far as there is any evidence from documents it points to Italian artists : there seem to have been schools in Rome, Naples, Milan and Ravenna, that owed nothing to Constantinople.¹ In spite of this, since all the work from the 4th century till the Lombards came to Italy (568) forms, together with Eastern work, as much one style as any in history, and since one must have a name for this style, the word Byzantine will do as well as any, and is far more reasonable than most such names of periods. We are here concerned with what was Byzantine in every sense, the local manner of Constantinople. From Constantine to Justinian is the period of formation. The city was begun in 328, dedicated on May 11, 330. Very little of the work of this first period remains. Constantine planned out the imperial quarter of the city as it has been ever since. On the southern point of the promontory, looking over the Propontis, he set up a series of connected buildings that made up the Residence. Right over the water was the palace, where Cæsar might watch his ships sailing out with the legions on board, or bringing the spoil back through the Hellespont. Behind the palace was the Hippodrome, where the races were held, the real centre of the life of Constantinople, the Forum, Senate-house, and the Emperor's church, dedicated to the Holy Wisdom of God. All these buildings have gradually been replaced by others even more sumptuous than the ones to adorn which Constantine ransacked the Empire.² The problem of this first period was

Maximian, who stands in his dalmatic, pænula and pallium, holding a cross, by Justinian's side. Maximian was bishop from 546 to 556, and also built St. Apollinaris in Classe, in 549. The green colour of these mosaics is special to Ravenna, green and gold, like its marshes.

¹ Kraus (*Gesch. der Christl. Kunst*, i, pp. 427, *seq.*) distinguishes three periods at Ravenna—pure Roman, Ostrogothic, Byzantine. Beissel (*Altchristl. Kunst u. Liturgie in Italien*, kap. 4, pp. 118–221) is inclined to see Roman and not Constantinopolitan work throughout, even in the mosaics of St. Vitalis that represent Justinian and Theodora with their courts. For the Byzantine question see especially Strzygowski : *Orient oder Rom.* (Leipzig, 1901), who traces all Byzantine work almost exclusively to Asia.

² St. Jerome says : "Constantinople was dedicated amid the nakedness of almost all the other cities" (Chron. A.D. 332).


to set a cupola on a square plan. The cupola is for Byzantine building what cross-vaulting is for Gothic. The older Romans had set it on a round wall, as at the Pantheon. Now they wanted to set it on a square base over their churches. At first all Christian churches had been built as long basilicas, even in the East; an example is St. Demetrius at Thessalonica (Saloniki). Then throughout Eastern Europe they began to build churches rather of the type of our baptisteries—round, or square, or eight-sided figures with apses on every side. Constantine's Golden Church at Antioch was the first famous example of this; it was copied in a few cases even in the West.¹ In Thessalonica is also one of the earliest of these round churches, St. George, a huge circle with a dome, like the Pantheon. But a circle is not a convenient plan for a church, so they wanted to put their cupola on a square. At first they simply cut off the corners by bridging across them, and on the eight sides thus made they set their round dome. The triumph of Byzantine engineering, and the greatest event of this development, was the discovery, gradually approached through infinite clumsy makeshifts, of the pendentive.

Then the time had come for the most splendid of all churches. In 532, while Justinian was reigning, for the second time the cathedral church of his city was burned down. The Emperor determined this time to build a church that should be the wonder of the world. Like its predecessors, it was to be dedicated to the Holy Wisdom (*ἡ ἁγία σοφία*), that is, to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, God the Son, the Word, to whom the text is understood to refer: "I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence . . . the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way," &c. (Prov. viii. 12-36). No other building has anything like as much importance in the history of architecture as the Hagia Sophia. Other great churches are, each of them, only one out of many of the same kind; this church rose, after humble and tentative efforts, as the one great example, the model on which a whole style was founded. It is not the daughter, it is the mother, of Byzantine architecture. Nothing that went before can be compared to it, and afterwards for

¹ See p. 15, n. 2.

centuries, down to our own time, Byzantine artists have had before them this one model, copied and imitated by all, but never rivalled.

The architects of Justinian's great church deserve that their names should be remembered : they were Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus, both from Asia Minor. Under them were one hundred foremen, under each foreman a hundred



PLAN OF THE CHURCH OF THE
HOLY WISDOM.

masons. These ten thousand workmen built with small bricks a church on this plan. A vast cupola rests, through pendentives, on four great arches that join as many massive piers. East and west against these arches rest half cupolas on semicircles ; from each of them, again, open out three smaller domed apses. North and south the arches are filled in with walls pierced by two galleries of arcading that open on to aisles divided into two stories. The outer walls of these aisles meet eastern and western walls, forming an almost perfect square.¹ Along the west front runs a double narthex, from which nine doors lead into the church, and in front of the narthex was a great atrium (forecourt), now destroyed. The cupola which

crowns the pyramid of curving lines

is not high. The Byzantine builders always understood the difference between a dome and a tower, and made their domes low and very broad, like the curve of the sky. No other covering gives such a sense of vastness to a space as these saucer-shaped cupolas.

To adorn his great church Justinian spent fabulous sums. The old Greek builders had been content with the more reticent beauty of white marble. Justinian wanted a dazzling gorgeous-

¹ It is 77 by 76·70 metres.

ness of gold, coloured marble, mosaic, precious stones. So from every corner of the Empire the governors had to send columns taken from old temples, marble, jewels, and incredible sums of money. Eight pillars of verde antico came from Ephesus, as many of porphyry from Rome. Egypt was the richest province of the Empire, and a year's taxes from the whole of Egypt went to pay for one ambo. The altar was of solid gold, gleaming with emeralds. Six thousand gilt candlesticks hung around, and the light from their burning candles glowed back from rubies and sapphires, sheets of gold and silver, enamel and mosaic and marble of every colour, so that the church must have shone with a dazzling splendour, like that of the city of God in the Apocalypse. Above the doors of the narthex, in the tympanum, was a huge mosaic of our Lord. It is the type of the Byzantine Christ. Very stately he sits on a throne, looking across the city with a calm majesty that makes him seem far removed from our troubles. His right hand is lifted up to give the "Eastern" blessing—two fingers raised, and the third touching the thumb; in the left hand he holds a book: "Peace be with you. I am the Light of the world." On either side are medallions of our Lady and St. Michael, and, kneeling, before him is Cæsar in his diadem. It is the lord of the world worshipping the Lord of Heaven.

The church was dedicated on St. Stephen's Day, December 27, 537.¹ When Justinian saw it finished he said: "Glory be to God, who has found me worthy to do such a work. Solomon, I have beaten you." Alas! next year an earthquake brought down the cupola. They built it up again at once, and used bricks specially made at Rhodes, of which five weighed no more than one ordinary one. They were so anxious not to shake the building that, when they had to bring down the inner scaffolding, they flooded the church with water, and let the great poles fall into that. This is the cupola that one may still see rising, a gleaming white curve, above the marble quays and the slender, dark cypress trees from the waters of the Propontis. No church is of such importance in the history of architecture, and no church

¹ That is their St. Stephen's Day. On December 26th they keep the Memory of the holy Mother of God.

has been so bound up with the history of a people as the Holy Wisdom. It was under this dome that seventy-four Emperors were crowned. Here Ignatius refused Holy Communion to Bardas; the Synod of 869 deposed Photius; the three Legates, in 1054, said, "Let God see to it and judge," as they laid the Bull of Excommunication on the altar. It was at the old altar under the dome of the Holy Wisdom that, in 1204, the Latin Mass announced to the angry Byzantines that they must now obey a Latin lord, and that, fifty-seven years later, the Greek Liturgy told them that their own Emperor was restored. Here Constantine XII received Holy Communion on the morning of May 29, 1453, before he went out to die for his city and his Empire, and now, on a column in the church, you may still see the blood-red mark of Mohammed the Conqueror's hand. Since the Turk sits on the throne of Justinian, his faith is preached in Justinian's church. He has covered up the old Saints with the names of the four Khalifahs, and has put a Mihrab pointing to Mecca behind the place where the old altar stood. To the Turk the church has been almost as important as to the Christian: it has been the model of a whole school of his architecture, too.¹ But whatever remnants of enthusiasm or chivalry remained among the Christians under his rule clung to the great church they had lost. The Holy Wisdom was a type of the old Empire, and the rayahs who dreamed of the day when their land should once more be Christian and free, summed up all their hope in the one picture of its reconsecration.

They have taken the City, they have taken it, they have taken Thessalonica,
 They have taken the Holy Wisdom, the great Cathedral,
 Which had three hundred altar-bells and sixty two great bells to chime.
 For every bell was a priest, for every priest a deacon.
 And as the Most Holy was taken, and the Lord of the world went out,
 A voice was heard from heaven, a voice from the Angels' mouth:
 "Leave off your psalms," they said, "set down the Most Holy, and send
 Send to the land of the Franks, and tell them to come back to take it,
 To take the golden Cross, and the book of the holy Gospels,
 And to take the holy altar, lest the Turks should destroy or defile it."
 But when our Lady heard of this, she wept that the city had fallen.

¹ The great mosque of Ahmed is the best known example of a large class built in imitation of the Holy Wisdom.

Queen and Lady, do not weep, do not lament, but take comfort,
Some day, after years have gone past, once more the great Church shall
be yours.¹

But architecture was not the only Byzantine art. It seems at first strange that, whereas the sculpture of the human figure was the greatest achievement of old Greek art, it should have suddenly and entirely come to an end about the year 300. But this fact is the result of Christian feeling. To Christians the beautiful Greek statues were simply the homes of unclean devils. It was for refusing to worship these gods that their fathers had been torn and mangled in the circus; so they would have nothing like them. They had no prejudice against images; on the contrary, theologically, they have always held the same position as we do, and practically the holy Ikons play a much more conspicuous part in the East than in the West. But the Ikon must be flat—it may be mosaic, painting, even bass-relief, but—especially since the Iconoclast troubles—the flatter the picture the more orthodox it is. The Byzantine artists could carve stone with amazing skill, as the capitals of their columns show, only it must not be the human figure. They carved twisted leaves and networks of twining branches, geometric patterns and crosses, baskets with birds peeping out, lions and lambs, doves and peacocks. The feeling of their carving alone shows that Byzantine work has quite definitely crossed the line from the classical to the mediæval manner. Their instinct was for gorgeousness, and they found a natural outlet for it in the glowing colours of marble and small mosaic. The Romans had used mosaic for their pavements, but now it became incomparably richer and brighter, and was put along walls and spandrels and to line domes. Whether made by Greek artists or not, the mosaics at Ravenna are the classical example of this work, Byzantine in manner at any rate. There is no perspective, no multitude of shades to make the figures look plastic, no shadows. Against backgrounds of gold or blue

¹ A poem written soon after the fall of the city. I have kept the rather halting metre of the original. The last two lines are quite beautiful:

σώπα, κύρα δέσποινα, μὴ κλαίῃς, μὴ δακρύζῃς,
πάλε μὲ χρόνους, μὲ καιρούς, πάλε δικά σου εἶναι.

The whole text in Artemides: *Ὁρφικὴ λύρα* (Athens, 1905), 141.

the figures stand all in one plane, Justinian and his Court, Theodora and her ladies, long processions of Saints in blues and greens and scarlet, the colours put sharply against one another in broad, flat masses, sometimes covered with patterns and with black lines to outline the folds. Very rich and sumptuous, standing as calm and as stately as the palm trees between them, these figures still show the image of that court by the Bosphorus, where the Roman name still lingered, that was lifted above the new world our fathers were hewing out of its lost provinces by the unapproachable majesty of its memories. Byzantine jewellery and metal work, too, were famous throughout Europe all through the middle ages. To set rubies and sapphires in gold with glowing enamel and strings of pearls was work in which these artists revelled. When the Crusaders came from their grey castles to Constantinople, they were dazzled by the magnificence they saw at the Emperor's Court. They told, when they came back, almost fabulous tales of the wonders they had seen, the costly toys, golden lions that roared, trees of jewels where enamelled birds flapped their wings and sang, thrones of ivory and sheets of porphyry, and then the incredible cleverness of those "Romans" in the East. No wonder the plain-living Frankish knights were intoxicated with the sight of such splendour, and that all over Western Europe the distant Roman Court became a sort of fairy tale of half mythical sumptuousness.¹ And the influence of what the Franks had seen there, of the treasures they sometimes brought back, was felt during all the middle ages. Still the King of Hungary wears a gorgeous piece of Byzantine jewellery with Byzantine enamels as the crown of St. Stephen and the symbol of the Apostolic kingdom, and amid the fields of Essex you may go into Copford Church and see above the altar the figure of the Byzantine Christ in glory, with his court of Saints and the signs of the zodiac, who has come all this way from the Church of the Holy Wisdom.

¹ Jordanes the Goth († 560) wrote after he had seen Constantinople: "Now I see what I have often heard, but have never believed, the glory of so great a city. . . . The Emperor of this land is indeed a god upon earth, and if any man lift his hand against him, that man's blood be upon his own head."

Summary.

Until the schism, then, the faith of the Eastern Churches was that of Rome. The development of doctrine went on in parallel lines in East and West, and the communication between the Churches, the councils, where bishops from different countries met, controlled and guided it. What differences there were did not affect points of faith ; they were the natural result of different temperaments and attitudes of mind. There were real differences in ritual. The Eastern Churches have always had their own liturgies, as venerable and as beautiful as ours. But all the liturgies contain the same essential elements, they all obey our Lord's command to do as he did at the Last Supper, in memory of him. The other religious practices of Eastern Christians already had a markedly Eastern character. The morals of the Emperor's Court often sank very low ; but there were continual revivals, and Constantinople succeeded in keeping off the Moslem for eight centuries. It was the leading city in Europe in the arts of civilization. Its architecture, painting, mosaic, form the bridge between classical Greek work and our mediæval art, while the unequalled splendour of the Court where the Roman Emperor still reigned made it the wonder of the world. In all these things the line that connects our civilization with that of the old Roman world and with the Greek States, the unbroken chain of continuity in European civilization, runs for many centuries through Constantinople.

PART II
THE SCHISM

WE are accustomed to speak of the "Photian" schism, and to look upon Photius as its originator. This conception is not an unjust one. Photius was, far more than any other one man, responsible for the schism; he is the Luther of the Orthodox Church,¹ and, if one would attach the whole story to one name, there is no doubt that it should be his. At the same time, the movement is not contained in the story of Photius's life. We have seen that there had been many such schisms before his time (p. 96), and the quarrel that he caused was soon patched up, if not very heartily, and did not finally break out again till about 150 years after his death. Even then a reunion was arranged on two later occasions by the Councils of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439), although each time it came to nothing. Nevertheless the schismatical Eastern Church has always looked upon Photius (he is St. Photius to her) as the champion of her cause against Rome, and we too consider him not wrongly as the father of their schism. This part will naturally fall into two chapters, describing the first schism under Photius and the second under Michael Cerularius.

¹ Kattenbusch, art. *Photius* in Herzog and Hauck's *Realenz. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche* Leipzig, 1904).

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHISM OF PHOTIUS

1. The Patriarch Ignatius (846-857).

IN 846 Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople, died. At that time all the Orthodox Eastern Churches were in full communion with Rome. The Iconoclast troubles were just over. They had broken out again after the seventh general council (Nicænum II, 787) under the Iconoclast Emperor Leo V (the Armenian, 813-820), but at last Theodora, widow of the Emperor Theophilus (829-842) and Regent for her son, Michael III (842-867), had recalled the holy images on the first "Feast of Orthodoxy" (February 19, 842), and the Church of Constantinople had finally returned to communion with Rome. Throughout the Iconoclast persecution the Popes had steadily defended the images. We have seen how the image-worshippers in the East had appealed to the faith of Rome and to the authority of the Pope (St. Theodore of Studium, pp. 65-66). Methodius had been one of the champions of the same cause; he had formerly taken refuge in Rome during the persecution, and he was a friend of Pope Nicholas I (858-867), as well as a devout client of St. Peter and a defender of the rights of his see.¹ Now he was dead and the clergy of Constantinople met to choose his successor. By the advice of the Empress Theodora, but also by a free, canonical, and unanimous election, they chose the Hegoumenos (Abbot) of the monastery of Satyrus, Ignatius.

¹ Nicholai I, cp. 8, ad Michaellem Aug. M.P.L. cxix. 946.

Ignatius was the youngest son of the Emperor Michael I (811-813) and his wife Procopia. When Michael I was deposed, by Leo V he and his children were shut up in a monastery. The youngest son, then called Nicetas, became a monk when he was only fourteen years old, and took the name Ignatius. The usurper, by shutting up his rival's family in a monastery, meant to put an end to their career in the world. But then, as now, the road to high places in the Eastern Church led through the Lauras. At the Laura of Satyrus Ignatius gradually became the most important member of the community. He received Holy Orders, and was elected Hegoumenos. The next change was to the highest place in Eastern Christendom. The Empress sent an embassy to Pope Leo IV (847-855) to announce the appointment of the new Patriarch, as was the custom, and she in her message insisted on the free election by which he had been chosen, as also on his virtues and merits. The bishops who had elected him wrote to the same effect.¹ The Roman See therefore acknowledged Ignatius as Patriarch; that it would not change nor cease to do so was the cause of the schism. But no one disputes that Ignatius was canonically elected and was rightful Patriarch, at any rate for the first eleven years. The Orthodox Church always counts him as one in her lists. The question at issue was rather the right of the Government to depose him. Ignatius from the beginning had some enemies. The head of the opposition was Gregory Asbestos, Metropolitan of Syracuse in Sicily.² Probably because of the Arab invasion of his island this Gregory was living at Constantinople. It is not easy to find out how his quarrel with Ignatius began. Perhaps it was only about some political question; perhaps Gregory, the friend and countryman of Methodius, had hoped to succeed him himself. There is one account by which his ordination was supposed to be irregular, and while his cause

¹ Nich. I, ep. 5, ad Mich. *l.c.* p. 119; ep. 13, p. 791.

² Sicily belonged by right to the Roman Patriarchate, but Leo III, the Isaurian (717-741), had joined it, as well as Illyricum, to Constantinople by force (p. 44). Under Syracuse were all the Sicilian dioceses (except Catania) and Malta.

was being examined he presented himself, with the other bishops, at Ignatius's consecration. Ignatius then told him to stand back, and not to show himself until his own affairs were set to rights. Some of the reasons given are quite absurd.¹ Whatever the cause may have been, Gregory and two other bishops who had taken his side organized an opposition to the Patriarch, and continually tried to work up the Court and the people against him. Ignatius had several times summoned them to a synod to be tried, when at last, in 854, he excommunicated them for insubordination and schism. Gregory Asbestos and his friends would not have been able to do much harm to the Patriarch had not the Government at the same time fallen foul of him.

The Court was then in an indescribable state of corruption. Theodora retired from public affairs in 856. Her son, Michael III, was still very young, and so her brother Bardas became a sort of regent with the title Cæsar. Michael was as vicious a young man as any that reigned at Constantinople, and to him the Imperial throne was just a means for enjoying himself. It is said that Bardas encouraged him so as to keep all the power in his own hands. Most of the Emperors had a surname given to them. This one has gone down to history as Michael the Drunkard (*μεθυστής*). Bardas was no better. His chief offence was that he put away his lawful wife and lived in open and shameless incest with his daughter-in-law, Eudokia. Ignatius then did what every bishop would be bound to do. He had already borne much from the Court. The drunken boy who stood at its head had found a suitable way of diverting himself by laughing at his religion. He had appointed a clown from the circus to be "his Patriarch." Dressed up in a caricature of bishop's vestments this man used to hold mock services, mimicking Ignatius, amid the shouts of laughter of Michael, his mistresses, and his companions. Ignatius had protested to no purpose, but this incest of the Cæsar could not be passed over. It was a

¹ For instance, Gregory accused Ignatius of speaking disrespectfully of the memory of Methodius, and thereby becoming a parricide: Cf. Hergenröther, *Photius*, i. pp. 358, seq.

notorious scandal throughout the Empire. Again he warned him, and commanded him to put away Eudokia. Bardas took no notice, and then, while still in this state of sin, he came with the rest of the Court to receive Holy Communion on the Epiphany in 857. The Patriarch refused it to him. That was his treason and offence. Michael was furious at the insult offered to his uncle, but Ignatius stood firm. A man who continued to live in public sin could not receive Holy Communion. Then came the affair of Theodora. Michael and Bardas thought they could get her out of the way by making her a nun, so they wanted the Patriarch to cut off her hair and put her into a nunnery. This, too, he refused to do as long as she herself was unwilling. The Emperor and the Cæsar then determine to get rid of Ignatius. They join forces with the party of Gregory Asbestos, condemn Ignatius to be deposed and exiled as a traitor. On November 23, 857, he is dragged off to the island Terebinth. The last thing he did before going into exile was to forbid his clergy to say the liturgy or to perform any rites in the cathedral till he came back. He put the great church under an interdict.¹ Michael and Bardas, having got rid of the lawful Patriarch, now look around for some more complaisant person to intrude into his see. They found the very man they wanted in Photius.

2. Photius.

Photius (Φωτίος) was one of the most wonderful men of all the middle ages. Had he not given his name to the great schism, he would always be remembered as the greatest scholar of his time, and as, in every way, the greatest man in the Byzantine Church. Since St. John Damascene († 744) no Eastern Church has produced any one who could be compared to Photius. He was born about 827; his father's name was Sergius. In after years his enemies had many stories to tell about his birth. The mother, they said, was an escaped nun; many holy bishops and confessors had foretold such horrible things of his future that

¹ For all this story see Hergenröther, i. 357-373, and the authorities there quoted. The facts are not, as far as I know, disputed by any one. Ignatius was condemned and exiled without any sort of trial, *l.c.* 372.

Sergius determined to kill him and the mother at once ; only they said, "You cannot prevent what God has ordained." Others, apparently with a rather confused recollection of the book of Genesis, compared his mother to Eve bringing forth the serpent.¹ All these stories are, of course, the calumnies of his enemies. There is no evidence that he was illegitimate. It is true that he was afterwards continually called a bastard, just as he was called a parricide, adulterer and murderer, but these are only the amenities of theological controversy. All that we know of his kin is that they were a great and lordly house, who had been distinguished for orthodoxy and had even suffered persecution in Iconoclast days. Photius was some relation of the Patriarch Tarasius (784-806), in whose time the seventh general council had been held (p. 80). He had had no intention of receiving Holy Orders : his career was to be that of a rhetorician and statesman. We know nothing about his teachers ; but very soon he began to develop his extraordinary talent. All his contemporaries speak of his astounding memory and untiring power of work. He sat up for long nights reading, and he had read everything. So great an impression did he make on his pupils that they told stories of a contract made by him with the Devil—he had sold his soul for knowledge.² He was a sort of universal genius, philosopher, philologist, theologian, lawyer, mathematician, natural scientist, orator, poet. His extant works fill five volumes of Migne ;³ Hergenröther has published a collection of addenda.⁴ His most important work is the *Myriobiblion* ("Thousand Books," the *Bibliotheca Photii*). It is an incomplete list of books he had read (only 280 out of 1,000), with descriptions of their contents, often long quotations and critical notes about their authors. All kinds of books on philosophy, rhetoric, history, grammar, medicine, &c., are quoted without any order. The *Myriobiblion* is the only

¹ Cf. Hergenröther, i. pp. 317, *seq.*

² This is an exact parallel to the legend of a great Western scholar, Gerbert (Sylvester II, 999-1003).

³ P.G. ci.-cv.

⁴ *Monumenta græca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentia*, Regensburg, 1869. Cf. Krumbacher : *Byz. Litt.* 73-78, 515-524.

harbour in which a number of Greek classics have been saved from oblivion. His *Amphilochia* is a collection of 326 theological essays, also put together without any order in the form of question and answer, and addressed to Amphilochius, Metropolitan of Cyclicus, one of Photius's numerous pupils. Then there are a number of canonical works and controversy written in after years against the Latins and various heretics, commentaries on parts of the Bible, a Lexicon of Classical and Biblical Greek words that were no longer understood in the 9th century, sermons, and a large collection of letters.

Photius was then already a very famous man when the Patriarch Ignatius was sent into exile. He was closely connected with the Court. His brother Sergius had married Irene, the sister of Bardas and aunt of the Emperor. He himself held two important offices: he was Secretary of State (*πρωτοσηκρήτης*) and Captain of the Life Guard (*πρωτοσπαθάριος*). He was unmarried, so there would be no difficulty about that, and he was already an eager partisan of Gregory Asbestas and of the opposition to Ignatius. Under these circumstances Michael III and Bardas offered him the See of Constantinople, which they pretended was vacant, and he accepted it. In six days he hurriedly received all the orders,¹ and on Christmas Day, 857, Gregory, although himself suspended and excommunicate, consecrated him Patriarch. We should notice at once that this iniquitous proceeding would be much less of a shock to the people of Constantinople than it is to us. They were accustomed to see all kinds of depositions, and they usually quietly accepted what had happened without troubling about injured rights. Emperors were continually deposed and then murdered, or blinded, or shut up in a monastery by a usurper, and no one took any pains to distinguish between the sovereigns *de iure* and *de facto*. So also the Government, especially since the schism, when there is no Pope to interfere, has deposed and

¹ This was a further breach of Canon Law. The Interstices in the Eastern Church were one year for each order. Can. Ap. 80, Sardic. 10. The three offences Photius committed on that Christmas Day were that he was ordained to an already occupied see by an excommunicate bishop without having kept the Interstices. Offence number two made him excommunicate *latæ sententiæ*.

exiled patriarchs and set up intruders in their see over and over again. The Sultans in later years have never ceased doing so down to our own time, and the Orthodox historians print the names of all these bishops one after another, just as they *de facto* held the see.

Nevertheless Photius and the Court were very anxious to get Ignatius to resign. In case he would not do so they already foresaw trouble with Rome. So they sent messengers to persuade him to sign a document of resignation. His bishops had already promised to stand by him, and he now and to the end of his life steadfastly refused to give up his right.¹ Soon afterwards the bishops who remained true to him met and declared Photius, the intruded anti-patriarch, and all his followers to be excommunicate. Photius answered by pronouncing the same sentence on Ignatius and on his followers. The Government then began to persecute the Ignatian bishops. Metrophanes of Smyrna, their leader, was shut up in a dungeon, others were sent into exile, imprisoned, tortured. But the worst part fell upon Ignatius himself. He was taken to Mitylene, chained in a prison without enough food, and beaten in the face till his teeth were knocked out,² to make him resign. But Photius himself wrote to Bardas to protest against the way his opponents were treated.³ On the other hand he evicted a number of Ignatian bishops⁴ and intruded his own friends into their sees. Both the Emperor and Photius then write to the Pope to persuade him that everything is in order.

Fortunately, when this great crisis between the two halves of Christendom at last came, the Roman See was occupied by one of the very greatest of the Popes. Nicholas I (858-867) stands out as the champion of the Catholic side, as much as Photius was of the Byzantine Church that he was about to drag into

¹ This, which is the cardinal fact of the whole story, is not now disputed by any historian. Kattenbusch, in his article "Photius" in the *Protestant Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, says: "Ignatius (at this time, 857) had not resigned his office, nor did he ever do so" (ed. 1904, vol. 15, p. 378).

² Hergenröther, i. 384, and his references.

³ The letter quoted *l.c.* pp. 388, *seq.*

⁴ The monks of Studium were always faithful to Ignatius and formed the centre of his party.

schism. Nicholas was the greatest Pope between Gregory the Great (590-604) and Gregory VII (1073-1085). It was a very bad time in the West. After the death of Lewis the Pious (successor of Charles the Great, 814-840) the treaty of Verdun (843) divided his lands between his three sons, Lothar the Emperor, Lewis the German, and Charles the Bald. There were wars against Slavs and Normans, the Carling kings fought amongst themselves, other pretenders were set up; then came the Magyars. In all this time of violence and disorder one great figure stands out, that of Nicholas I. Like Gregory I, he was a Roman of one of the great houses, and like Gregory he showed the instinct of his Roman blood as a statesman and organizer. The claim of Photius was only one of many affairs he had to settle. At the same time he was bringing a rebellious Archbishop of his own Patriarchate, John of Ravenna, to his knees, he was standing out sternly for the sacredness of marriage in the affair of Lothar II's divorce, he was defending the suffragans of the province of Rheims against the tyranny of their Metropolitan,¹ and the freedom of the Church against Charles the Bald. In the century that followed Nicholas I, the Roman See sank to the lowest depth she ever reached; far worse than the Borgias and Medicis of the Renaissance were the horrible Stephens and Johns of the 10th century. A contemporary writer says of St. Nicholas I (he is a canonized Saint): "Since the time of Blessed Gregory (the Great) no one who has been raised to the Papal dignity can be compared to him. He commanded kings and tyrants as if he were the lord of the world. To good bishops and priests, to pious laymen, he was kind, humble, gentle and meek, to evil-doers he was terrible and stern. People say rightly that God raised up in him a second Elias."²

It was to this Pope that Photius appealed to get his place confirmed. He begins his letter: "To the most holy and venerable brother and fellow-bishop, Nicholas, Pope of Old

¹ This is, of course, the affair of Hincmar of Rheims († 882) and Rothad of Soissons. Hincmar was a tyrant on that occasion, although otherwise one of the greatest, wisest, and best of all mediæval bishops.

² Regino: *Chronicon*. an. 868. *Mon. Germ. hist. Script.* i. 579.

Rome, Photius, Bishop of Constantinople, New Rome." It is significant that neither he nor any of his predecessors ever called themselves Œcumenical Patriarch when writing to a Pope. The letter is very humble and very deceitful. He says that his predecessor had resigned his office, and that then he, Photius, had been unwillingly forced to succeed him by all the metropolitans, bishops, and clergy of Constantinople; there is a great deal about the tears he shed when he was forced to accept this dignity, he adds an elaborate and very orthodox profession of his faith and begs for the Pope's prayers.¹ The Emperor's letter (probably composed by Photius²) was to do the business really. They wanted legates to confirm the deposition of Ignatius and to acknowledge Photius; then everything would be safe. Michael asks for the legates, but says very little about the real question at issue. He represents that there are still some effects of the Iconoclast trouble at Constantinople, which could best be put in order by a synod; will the Pope then send legates to this synod with full powers to deal with all disorders? Incidentally he mentions that the former Patriarch Ignatius has resigned because of his great age and weak health, he has retired to a very comfortable life in one of the monasteries founded by himself; unfortunately he had been guilty of various offences, such as forsaking his diocese, disobeying Papal decrees and being mixed up in treasonable conspiracies, for which his successor had been compelled to excommunicate him. This and all other matters the legates will be able to arrange when they come.³ The letter is much too clever to be the Drunkard's own composition.

The Pope in answer sends two legates with letters⁴ and instructions not to pass any sentence as yet, but to examine the claims of either side and to report. They were Rodoald, Bishop of the Portus Tiberis (Porto), and Zacharias, Bishop

¹ The whole letter is printed in Hergenröther, i. pp. 407-411.

² So Nicholas thought, *l.c.* p. 407.

³ This letter is not extant. Its contents are to be deduced from Nicholas's answer, ep. 9. M.P.L. C. 1019, ep. 98. Cf. Herg. i. p. 407.

⁴ He addresses Photius very cautiously, only as: "Vir prudentissime"; he blames his neglect of the Interstices, but promises to acknowledge him eventually, if he finds that everything has been done justly and rightly.

of Anagnia (Anagni). These two persons were the worst ambassadors ever sent by the Holy See to any place. Like other of their countrymen on other occasions, they arrived, their hands outstretched, their palms itching for bribes. Already on the way, at Rhœdestus on the Propontis, they are met by envoys from Photius who bring them costly gifts and especially beautiful clothes. When they arrive they are carefully kept from seeing any of Ignatius's friends; they hear all sorts of calumnies against him, and threats of what will happen to themselves if they disappoint the Emperor; meanwhile more presents come pouring in. The two bishops then throw overboard their honour and their loyalty to their Patriarch, and promise to do just as Michael and Photius wish. In May, 861, the synod meets in the Hagia Sophia; Michael and Bardas are present with a number of their courtiers and a splendid retinue. Ignatius presents himself in his patriarchal robes, but outside the Church a messenger from the Emperor meets him and forces him to take them off, and to appear only in his monk's habit, treating him as if already condemned and deposed before the trial begins. The most disgraceful part of the whole proceeding was that Photius, the plaintiff in the case, sat among the judges. Ignatius is then made to leave all his friends outside and to appear alone. He turns to the Legates and asks them what they are doing there. "We are the vicars of the Roman Pope Nicholas," they say, "and we have been sent to judge your case." Ignatius answers that he asks nothing better than to be judged by the Pope; "but," he says, "first dismiss that adulterer there,¹ otherwise you are not judges." All the Legates have to answer is, pointing to Michael, "He wishes it to be so."² Ignatius quotes the case of St. John Chrysostom's appeal to Innocent I to show that he cannot yet be deposed. When a bishop, he says, appeals to the Pope he cannot be sentenced before the decision

¹ Photius. The name is deserved in this case; he had taken to himself the Church of Constantinople, the lawful spouse of Ignatius. What Ignatius means is that if the Legates join themselves to Photius they act, not as judges, but as his advocates.

² οὕτω θέλει ἐκεῖνος,

has come from Rome. He also quotes the 4th Canon of Sardica (pp. 68, 69) to the same effect. Finally, with a dignified protest against this mockery of a trial, he formally appeals from these miserable and corrupt Legates to the Pope himself. But the synod pronounces sentence on him all the same. They dress him up in a set of vestments, then the Sub-deacon Procopius (whom he in former days had suspended for immorality) solemnly takes them off and every one, Legates and all, cries out the old formula : "Ignatius unworthy!"¹ The Legates sign the acts of the synod, deposing Ignatius and acknowledging Photius ; then they go back home, laden with still more gifts.² The council had drawn up some other decrees, against Iconoclasm, &c., as a sort of blind, and for a time the Byzantines tried to get it recognized as an œcumenical synod, an attempt which came to nothing.³ Here, too, the fatal incapacity of Greeks and Latins to understand one another confused the issue. The Pope had written in Latin and they had translated his letter quite wrongly : the Legates in this case were probably in good faith because they could not follow the Greek version. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, the contemporary chronicler of all this story, says : "The Roman Legates could not understand what was being read."⁴ The Pope thought that the Greeks had mistranslated his letter on purpose. He says : "Among the Greeks such an impertinence is common, as various writings at different times show." And again he quotes another letter of Adrian I that was kept in the Archive at Constantinople, and then adds : "unless it has been tampered with after the manner of the Greeks."⁵ The Emperor sent his Secretary of State, Leo, to Rome immediately after the Legates with two more letters for the Pope, one from himself and one from Photius. He encloses the acts of the synod, which he praises as a most holy and blessed assembly, worthy to be compared with the first of Nicæa. He says that it has deposed Ignatius according to the holy Canons and has, together with the Legates, acknowledged

¹ Ἰγνάτιος ἀνάξιτος.

² Herg. i. pp. 419-428.

³ The synod that the Orthodox now call the eighth œcumenical one is not this but that of 879 (p. 163).

⁴ Præf. in Conc. viii. (Mansi, xvi. p. II.)

⁵ Nic. ep. 9, *cit.*

Photius. He also warmly praises these Legates. Photius's letter is a very long one.¹ He, too, misrepresents the whole business, protests his obedience to the Pope: "In order to prove our obedience to your fatherly love in all things," &c.,² and greatly praises Rodoald and Zachary: "Indeed the Legates of your fatherly Holiness are men illustrious by their prudence, virtue, and manifold wisdom, who honour him who sent them by their manners as much as did the disciples of Christ."³ In short, he hopes that it will now be all right.

Meanwhile Ignatius also carried out his purpose of appealing directly to the Pope. He managed to send his friend the Archimandrite Theognostus⁴ to Rome with a letter beginning: "Ignatius, tyrannically deposed and much tried, and his fellow-sufferers, ten Metropolitans, fifteen Bishops, and many Archimandrites, Priests, and Monks, to our lord, the most holy and blessed Patriarch of all Sees, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, the Œcumenical Pope⁵ Nicholas, and to the most holy Bishops under him⁶ and to all the most wise Church of the Romans, health in the Lord."⁷ His letter is short compared with the long rhapsody of Photius. He exposes his case and ends: "Do you also, most holy lord, show to me your lovingkindness and say with the great Paul: Who is weak and I am not weak?⁸ Remember the great Patriarchs, your predecessors, Fabian, Julius, Innocent, Leo,⁹ in short all who fought for truth against injustice, and rise up as our avenger, since we are so unworthily mishandled."

On the eve of Whitsunday a party of soldiers came to seize Ignatius; the Government wanted to cut off his right hand and blind him; but he just escaped and hid himself. Michael III

¹ Quoted by Herg. i. pp. 439-460.

² *L.c.* p. 452.

³ *L.c.* p. 457.

⁴ He was "Archimandrite of the Laura of Old Rome" at Constantinople, one of the many Latin monasteries in the East.

⁵ This is an example of the use of the title by other people, whereas the Popes never used it themselves, see p. 43, n. 3.

⁶ The *episcopi suburbicarii*.

⁷ The letter in Herg. i. 460-461.

⁸ *I.e.*, the disgrace of Ignatius's deposition would reflect on the Pope himself, unless he tried to prevent it.

⁹ Some of the most famous instances of Popes who had received appeals from the East.

went on getting drunk and cared nothing for the affairs of his Empire; he knew quite well that the wretched people, as far as they dared have a will of their own, were on the side of the rightful bishop. Nicetas David, the friend and biographer of Ignatius, has preserved some of the Emperor's jokes on the subject. "There are three Patriarchs," he said; "mine is Theophilus Gryllus (the clown), the Patriarch of the Cæsar (Bardas) is Photius, and that of the people is Ignatius."¹ He had no respect for Photius; on one occasion he told him that he had a face like a Khazar,² another time he called him "Marzuka," a cryptic name which Photius, who was much hurt by it, elaborately explains as meaning a dog who steals shoe leather.³

Meanwhile what was happening in Rome? The two Legates came back with their gifts hidden away and gave as specious an account of what had happened as they could (861). Then came Leo, the Emperor's secretary, with the letters from his master and Photius. Nicholas waited a long time till he had heard the other side. At last in 862 Theognostus arrives with Ignatius's letter. Then the Pope, having examined the whole matter, decides for Ignatius. He answers the letters of Photius and Michael. To Photius, whom he again addresses only as "Vir prudentissimus," giving him no title, he refutes all his arguments, insists on the right of the Holy See, which Photius himself had completely acknowledged, and sternly commands him to give up the place he has usurped.⁴ To the Emperor he insists on the facts that he himself had entirely recognized Ignatius when he was first made Patriarch, that Ignatius had held the see in peaceful possession for twelve years, that the Legates had grossly misused their power. "We advise and command you, beloved son and

¹ Herg, i. p. 356, n. 36.

² Symeon Mag. de Mich. and Theod. (ed. Bonn, 1838), p. 674. The Khazars were a branch of the great Turkish family who were attacking the Empire from the north. The statement was naturally offensive and doubtless wholly untrue.

³ *L.c.* p. 674. κύων ἔλκων δέρμα. I have no notion what the language is, but Photius explains: Mar=dog; zu=thief; kas=shoe leather, and he was a great philologist.

⁴ Herg, i. pp. 511-516.

most illustrious Augustus," he says, "at last to put down those who in their obstinacy are rebelling against the Bishop of the Church of Constantinople (Ignatius) . . . lest the honour of the Church of Christ, as well as the glory of the Imperial city, be lessened (which may God forbid) by your government."¹ Then he wrote an Encyclical to the other patriarchs, in which he reproaches the Court and Photius for these four offences : (1) That Ignatius was condemned without a fair trial ; (2) that a successor to his see had been appointed before sentence was given ; (3) that he had been judged by his own canonical subjects ; (4) that Photius, a layman, had been suddenly made Patriarch without observing the Interstices. "And we order and command you," he ends, "respecting the privilege of this See, to maintain with us in the same Catholic religion the restoration of the right of the venerable Patriarch Ignatius, and the expulsion of Photius the usurper."² He had no sort of personal prejudice against Photius. "Consider very carefully," he wrote to Michael, "how Photius can stand, in spite of his great virtues and universal knowledge."³ More Greeks of the Ignatian party then arrive in Rome and tell the Pope many further circumstances ; how Photius had been ordained by Gregory Asbestos, an excommunicate bishop, and the persecution, ill-usage, and torture that Ignatius and his friends had to suffer. Nicholas published a decree excommunicating any one who struck a bishop ; and then, since the affair was becoming more and more important, he summoned a great provincial synod at the Lateran in April, 863. This synod had chiefly to try the Legates for their conduct. At last these two ruffians got their desert. Rodoald was away on another embassy to King Lothar II the Frank,⁴ Zachary was present. For having betrayed their duty to their Patriarch, for having exceeded their powers and connived at the injustice of the Emperor, for having taken shameful bribes, they were degraded from their office as bishops and excommunicated. The Pope in Council also solemnly declares : "With the authority of the great Judge, our Lord

¹ Herg. i. pp. 516-519.² Ibid. pp. 510-511.³ Ep. 98, ad Mich. M.P.L. cxix. p. 1030.⁴ His divorce was then the burning question.

Jesus Christ, we determine, decide, and declare that Ignatius has not been deposed or excommunicate, that he was tyrannically driven from his see by the power of the Emperor without any canonical right, that he was only condemned by those who should themselves be condemned, who had no lawful authority, and who were not appointed by the Apostolic See for that purpose, so that the sentence has no value. Wherefore we, by reason of the authority given to us by God through the blessed Peter, by reason of the laws of the holy Canons and the Papal Constitutions, acknowledge him, our brother and fellow-bishop Ignatius, cancelling all contrary sentences, in his office and right as Patriarch and establish and confirm him therein."¹ Photius is to be excommunicate unless he retires from the usurped See of Constantinople as soon as he receives notice of this decision. Once more then, as in the cases of St. Athanasius, St. John Chrysostom, and so many others, Rome had spoken and had taken up the cause of a lawful bishop who was being persecuted by the civil power. The result was that the civil power dragged a great part of the Church into schism.

3. Open Schism.

It was at this juncture that Michael and Photius determined to throw off the authority of the Pope.² We have seen how they had hitherto acknowledged it. They had themselves appealed to Rome, they had asked for the Legates, they had stopped at nothing to have those Legates on their side. Now that the final decision had gone against them they had two alternatives left, to submit or to go into schism. Photius had lost his case by every right of Canon Law and by the decision of the highest court of Christendom, to which he himself had appealed. It would have been to the eternal disgrace of the Pope if he had not lost it. But he had one more card to play.

¹ Herg. i. pp. 519-523.

² They found some supporters in the West, among the Frankish bishops who were defending Lothar's divorce and so were already in opposition to the Pope. It was an alliance of which any respectable person would be ashamed.

As far as physical force went, no one could touch him. The Emperor was at hand with his soldiers, the Roman Patriarch could not send across the sea to turn him out. He would ignore the sentence, and use the old jealousies of the East against the West to carry the war into the enemies' camp, deny the Pope's authority altogether, and find whatever charges he could against the Latins.

First he strengthened his own position at home. Ignatius was kept chained in prison. The Papal letters were not allowed to be published; he insisted to the tyrants of the Government that this was their affair, they had put him in the place he held, the Roman Patriarch was trying to rule over their heads in their own land, the Ignatians were traitors for trying to protect themselves by the authority of this foreigner. It is the typical attitude of the schismatic, who betrays the Church to the State rather than obey the Pope. Then he dictates a letter from Michael to the Pope.¹ It is indescribably insolent. First he makes the Emperor say that it is a great honour for the Pope that he should again address him. He does not acknowledge him in any way as judge in this matter; as for the Legates, he had *commanded* their attendance and had not begged for them. All the Eastern Patriarchs are on his side. In spite of the Pope Photius will remain Patriarch; nothing the Pope can do will really help Ignatius. He demands an explanation of the Pope's treatment of Rodoald and Zachary, also that all the Ignatians who have fled to Rome should be handed over to him. Unless Nicholas retracts his decision in favour of Ignatius he, the Emperor, will come to Rome with an army to take a terrible vengeance.² Nicholas answers maintaining what he had done.

The schism was now complete. Nicholas had excommunicated Photius, Photius struck Nicholas's name from his diptychs; although of course the lawful Patriarch Ignatius was always in communion with Rome from his prison. This state of things

¹ Herg. i. pp. 552-554. There can be no doubt from internal evidence that this letter is Photius's work.

² These are the points quoted one by one in the Pope's answer; the letter itself is not extant.

lasted four years. During those years the situation was further complicated by the question of the Bulgarian Church.

4. The Question of Bulgaria.

The Bulgars were Turanians who had poured against the northern frontier of the Empire, coming from the middle of Asia, since the 6th century. In the year 861 Bogoris, their prince, wanted to become a Christian and to make his people be converted as well. He was baptized by a missionary sent from Constantinople, with many of his people. In 865 Photius wrote an Encyclical to Bogoris and his Bulgars, explaining the Christian faith and the duties of a Christian man.¹ There was as yet no bishop in Bulgaria. A layman from Constantinople came, pretending to be a priest and administering sacraments; then they discovered the fraud and cut off his nose and ears. Others come and set up business as prophets, magicians, and so on. Bogoris seems to have got tired of the Byzantines. He wanted to be free of them and to connect his Church rather with the Latins. So in 866 he sends an embassy to the Pope at Rome and another to the Emperor Lewis the German, King of the East Franks (843-876), at Regensburg. He begs the Pope to send him a patriarch, no less, to rule the Bulgarian Church, evidently wishing to be free of the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. But Nicholas knows of another way in which the Bulgars may be independent of Constantinople. They have settled in Illyricum, therefore they belong to the Latin Patriarchate. He sends them two bishops, Paul of Populonia and Formosus, who had succeeded the deposed Rodoald at the Portus Tiberis. With them he sends books and sacred vessels and an admirable pastoral letter answering all their questions and again explaining the Christian faith.² He promises them, not a patriarch but an archbishop, who shall have the Pallium from himself and shall then rule their Church. Formosus would have liked to be this archbishop; but Nicholas tells him to come back when the embassy is over and to look

¹ Herg. i. pp. 601-604. It is a very edifying and correct letter.

² The text in Herg. i. pp. 607-616.

after his own flock at home. Instead he sends one Dominic, who sets up his chair at Achrida,¹ having been ordained and having received the Pallium at Rome. The Bulgarian Church was established as part of the Roman Patriarchate. The Pope at the same time sent Legates to the Emperor to explain and defend what he had done ; but they were turned back from the frontier. The question then of who should have Bulgaria in his patriarchate very much embittered the quarrel between Photius and the Pope. The Byzantines had always wanted Illyricum to belong to them (pp. 44, 45) and they had been first in the Bulgarian field. On the other hand the Roman Patriarch had a much older claim to Illyricum ; he had founded the Bulgarian Church by setting up the first bishops, and the Bulgars themselves were on his side. Indeed Bogoris, when the Latin bishops had come, promptly drove out all the Greek missionaries and refused to accept Photius's chrism. This made Photius specially angry ; but from the point of view of the Latin bishops it was quite correct. The right of sending the consecrated chrism has long been a sign of jurisdiction in the Eastern Churches, just as much as that of ordaining bishops—to say nothing of the fact that Photius's chrism was consecrated by an excommunicate usurper. Eventually, when the schism was an established fact, the Bulgars went over to the side of Constantinople. But at last, after long centuries, the Church that Photius was so anxious to keep has in our own time become the chief thorn in the side of his successors, and the children of the men who drove away Photius's missionaries are now again refusing the Byzantine chrism (p. 316).

5. The Filioque.

Photius, now thoroughly angry with the Roman Court, at last prepares a final manifesto against it. In 867 he sends an Encyclical round to the Eastern Patriarchs, and, by way of carrying the war into the enemy's camp, he draws up the

¹ Now Ochrida, in Macedonia. Achrida was long the Metropolitan See of Bulgaria, see pp. 305, 317.

following accusations against the Latins. It will be seen that he has raked up any charges he can find. There are five points : 1. The Latins make the Bulgars fast on Saturday (so they do : that was then the universal custom in the Roman Patriarchate). 2. They eat butter, milk, and cheese during the first week of Lent (that is : we do not begin Lent till Ash Wednesday, whereas the Byzantines do on Quinquagesima Monday). 3. They despised married priests and thereby show themselves to be infected with Manichæan error. 4. They do not acknowledge Confirmation administered by a priest.¹ 5. They have changed and corrupted the Creed by adding to it the *Filioque*. The doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father and God the Son he described as "godless, atheistic, and blasphemous." Photius then declares : " We, by the decree of our holy synod, have therefore condemned these forerunners of apostasy, these servants of Antichrist who deserve a thousand deaths, these liars and fighters against God . . . and we have solemnly excommunicated them." ² He then proceeded to pretend to depose Pope Nicholas for these offences, and he tried to get the Western Emperor, Lewis II, to carry out his sentence. It should be noted that all these five points are local customs of the Latins. No one has ever tried to make Easterns fast on Saturday, eat cheese in Quinquagesima week, be celibate, stop priestly Confirmation, or say the *Filioque* in the Creed. The only quarrel against them was the iniquitous usurpation of Photius. In trying to turn his personal quarrel into a general dispute between the two great Churches he can find nothing better to say than to complain of some differences of custom, that were in no way his business, and on the strength of them to excommunicate all of us, over whom he had no pretence of jurisdiction, as well as our Patriarch, who was his own overlord as well. From this point the quarrel has shifted to a general one. It is no longer a question of Ignatius or Photius ; it has become what it still is, an issue between Latins and Greeks. And no one can doubt who in that issue was the

¹ This is false, p. 421.

² Herg. i. pp. 642-646. Kattenbusch (*l.c.* p. 380) calls this document the Magna Carta of the Eastern Churches.

aggressor.¹ It is the last of Photius's five accusations that eventually became, and still is, the shibboleth of the quarrel. It seems that Photius at first did not think more of it than of the other points he had discovered. But it was soon found to be by far the best charge that could be made. It had much the most appearance of being a real abuse, and it has given them the chance of calling us heretics. In order not to interrupt the course of this story we may put off the consideration of the question itself till we come to examine the faith of the Eastern Churches to-day. We need now only note that this Encyclical of Photius (867) is the first occasion on which the accusation was made against us, that although the question itself is far too subtle and too abstruse to have really caused so much bad feeling for its own sake, nevertheless it has ever since been looked upon by the Easterns as a sort of compendium of all our offences; this very remote speculation, that either way has certainly never for a moment affected the trinitarian faith or piety of any single human being, has become to them a standard of anti-Latin orthodoxy, and they cherish and value it accordingly. And it has always been their accusation against us, not ours against them. They have anathematized us for what we believe and have added to the Creed. We have never asked them to add the word to their Creed. And in the main issue (the anathema pronounced at Ephesus in 431 against any one who modified the Creed) they are absolutely, incredibly wrong about the fact.²

Photius, then, had launched his thunderbolt, deposing our Pope, excommunicating us all. It is not easy to know what at this juncture the other Orthodox patriarchs thought about the matter. They could have had no conception how far-reaching its effects would eventually be. They only knew that there was a violent quarrel going on between two

¹ Kattenbusch (*l.c.* 381) says: "He tried to lift New Rome above Old Rome. This Œcumenical Patriarch really thought he could obtain the Primacy for Constantinople." These admissions are the more significant, since there is no question as to the animus of the writers in the Prot. *Realenzyklopädie* against Rome.

² For all this see p. 372.

claimants to the See of Constantinople, and that one of them was very angry with the Pope. Neither fact was in any way a new one. Eventually, of course, they all sided with Constantinople. But, indeed, these Melkite Patriarchs were rather poor creatures. They had lost nearly all their sheep long ago. They all sat under the tyranny of the Moslem; the only great Christian lord they knew anything about was the Eastern Roman Emperor. They were already not much more than vassals of him and of his Patriarch. Soon they even came to live at Constantinople, as idle ornaments of a dying Court. The real chiefs of the Christian populations of Egypt and Syria were the Copt and the Jacobite. And they, as we have seen, had already for centuries been cut off from both Old and New Rome and had nothing whatever to do with this business, unless perhaps they took an unholy joy in seeing the persecuting Melkites at last fall foul of one another.

Photius, then, had won along the whole line. In spite of the Pope he sat firm on the patriarchal throne; the Court was all for him, no one could touch him, and he had punished the Latins for not recognizing him by excommunicating them. If the Pope had deposed him, he had answered by deposing the Pope.

Suddenly there came what was the most dramatic change in Church history. In the midst of his triumph he fell. Ignatius came out of his prison back to the Hagia Sophia, and Photius had to taste the very punishment he had given to Ignatius. It was no just or loyal movement that brought about this crisis. It was only one of the endless sordid and bloody Palace revolutions that fill up Byzantine history. The Imperial Equerry,¹ Basil the Macedonian, was a clever and ambitious fellow, and just as great a rogue as all the other courtiers. He succeeds first in murdering the Cæsar, Bardas (866), and becomes Cæsar himself. This was not enough for him; so in 867 the wretched Michael III ended his career by being murdered too. It was after supper on September 23rd when he was, as usual, drunk, that one of Basil's servants stabbed him to death.

¹ Πρωτοστράτωρ. He was the "count of the horse department," κόμης τοῦ ἱπποστασίου.

In the supper room reeking with spilt wine and blood, while Michael's mistresses were shrieking amid the overturned tables, Basil I (867-886) was proclaimed Augustus. From no love of justice or respect for the Pope's decree, but only out of a general hatred for all Michael's friends, Basil promptly deposed Photius and shut him up in a monastery. He then sent for the head of the rival party, Ignatius, and told him to be Patriarch again. As usual the people made no fuss, and, as long as they were not massacred, were just as ready to shout for Basil Augustus and Ignatius Patriarch as they had been for Michael and Photius.

In the same year, before he had heard of the sudden change at Constantinople, in the middle of many grave questions that were still undecided, Pope Nicholas I died (November 13, 867).

6. The Eighth General Council.

Nicholas's successor, Adrian II (867-872), was not unworthy of the great Pope whose place he took. He gathered up the reins, and in all the questions then pending, Lothar's divorce as well as the trouble at Constantinople, he carried on the policy of his predecessor. Soon after his accession he heard the news from the East. In the horrid but typical piece of Byzantine history that had just taken place neither Ignatius nor the Roman See had had any sort of part. On the other hand Rome had always recognized Ignatius as the rightful Patriarch, and however abominable the occasion by which he had been restored had been, Adrian, of course, could not cease to recognize him now that he had again come to his own. He also, according to the general practice of the Popes, accepted the situation in *political* matters and treated with Basil as Emperor.¹ It was Ignatius who first asked for a general council to clear up the whole business. As soon as he was restored, both he and Basil sent legates to Rome with exceedingly submissive and respectful letters to the Pope, asking among other things for a general council. Adrian first held a

¹ In any case, the Roman Empire was an elective monarchy and there was now no other claimant.

provincial synod at Rome (June, 869), in which Photius was again condemned, this time for having pretended to excommunicate Pope Nicholas. The same synod appointed the Papal Legates for the coming general council at Constantinople. They were Donatus, Bishop of Ostia, Stephan, Bishop of Nepi, and a deacon, Marinus.¹

These Legates arrived in Constantinople in September of the same year (869) with letters from Pope Adrian to Basil and Ignatius. They were received with great pomp, and on October 5th the council was opened in the Hagia Sophia: this is the *Eighth General Council* (Constantinople IV). The attendance was always very small: only in the last sessions were there as many as 102 bishops present. The Legates presided; then sat Ignatius, then the legates of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem; those from Alexandria did not arrive till the ninth session.

At the beginning of the first session the Emperor's representative and Ignatius asked the Legates to show their commission from the Pope. At first they are offended by what was an unusual request; but Ignatius explains that no one means any want of respect to them, still less to the great see they represent, only after the disgraceful way in which the former Legates—Rodoald and Zachary—had exceeded their powers the Eastern bishops thought it pertinent to ask this. The Legates are then satisfied; Marinus reads out their instructions from the Pope in Latin, and Damian the interpreter translates what they have read into Greek. "Praise God," says Ignatius, "who has now so completely satisfied us as to your Holiness."² All the members of the synod then signed the formula of Hormisdas (pp. 85, 86), which to Catholics has therefore the authority of a general council. The Imperial Commissioner asks the Legates of the other patriarchal sees why they had not also condemned Photius long ago. Elias

¹ Marinus afterwards became Pope—Marinus I (882–884).

² We now call only the Pope His Holiness; but such styles were long used very loosely. At Constantinople especially, where politeness was a very great consideration, such addresses as Your Holiness, Beatitude, Lordship, Clemency, Illustriousness, and what not, were thrown around recklessly.

from Jerusalem answers that Ignatius's right was so evident that it had not needed their support, and, in any case, the Patriarch of Old Rome had done all that was needed. The session then ended with the usual acclamations, the *Polychronion* that Greeks will always work in on every possible occasion: "To the Lord Basil Augustus many years! To the pious Lady Eudokia Augusta many years! To the Roman Pope Nicholas eternal memory! To the Pope Adrian, to Ignatius and the three holy Patriarchs many years! To the Orthodox Senate many years! To the holy and œcumenical synod eternal honour!"

The next sessions appointed penances to the repentant Photian bishops. On the whole they got off very easily. They expressed the deepest sorrow for their schism; there were ten bishops, eleven priests, nine deacons, six sub-deacons, who signed a document expressing their contrition. They are suspended till Christmas (this was in October); during that time they are to abstain from fleshmeat, fish, cheese, and eggs every Wednesday and Friday, say Kyrie eleison and "Lord have mercy on me a sinner" a hundred times a day, and say the 5th, 37th and 50th psalms¹ once a day. Then on Christmas Day they are all to be restored to their functions. In the fifth session the arch-offender of all, Photius himself, is brought before the council. He could not possibly expect to be acknowledged by this synod as Patriarch of Constantinople, that it should declare him an intruder was its obvious duty. Nor could the synod allow him to exercise the orders he had received from the excommunicate Gregory Asbestas. Otherwise he was treated well and respectfully. But he himself behaved very badly. First he sulked; then he played the martyr, and finally used the words that our Lord had spoken at his trial, making a comparison that was simply blasphemous. At first he would not speak at all. "Speak, Lord Photius," said Baanes, the Emperor's delegate; "say whatever you will to justify yourself. The whole world is represented here; take care that the synod does not withdraw all sympathy from you. To what tribunal would you appeal? To Rome? It is represented here. To the East? Here are its delegates.

¹ Of course in the LXX numbering.

For God's sake defend yourself." All Photius will say is : "Jesus did not escape condemnation through his silence," and "My defence is not of this world, if it were of this world you should hear it." True to the Erastian policy he had always followed, he ignores the Legates, refuses to speak to them, and only answers Baanes, the civil commissioner : "We will give an account to our holy Emperor," he says, "not to the Legates." He describes the repentant Photian bishops as "mice in tar," apparently meaning that they had got into as great a mess as a mouse would in a barrel of tar. The judgement of the synod on him was not harsh. He has to renounce his usurped claim and to acknowledge Ignatius, then he shall be admitted to lay communion. As he refuses to do so, he is again excommunicated. The council then passes a few more laws, chiefly against whatever remnants of the Iconoclasts may have still existed and against the interference of the State in ecclesiastical affairs. These last laws prove that, in spite of the presence of the Emperor's Commissioner (a presence that was according to the precedent of all former general councils), the synod was quite a free one.

The tenth and last session was held on February 28, 870, in the presence of the Emperor and of his son, Constantine. The Canons were read out and approved by all the members. Basil made a speech insisting on the independence of the Church, on her right to arrange her own affairs, and on the iniquity of civil interference in them—strange words in the mouth of an emperor. But he himself soon became the chief offender against these principles.

The synod ended with some pomp of display and with endless Polychronia. Its Acts were solemnly confirmed by Pope Adrian II.¹ It was acknowledged as the eighth general council by all the Easterns, except the Photian party, and it has always been so acknowledged by the Catholic Church.²

¹ Mansi, xvi. 247, 413, 414.

² All this description of the Council is taken from Hergenröther : *Photius*, ii. 63-132, where a detailed account of the proceedings will be found. The Acts of the council are preserved in the Latin version of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, the Roman librarian, as well as in a shorter Greek account, in Mansi, xvi. 308-409.

Photius now had to go into exile to Stenos on the Bosphorus, where his uncle Tarasius had built a monastery. He was certainly treated as a prisoner, but he was not starved nor tortured as Ignatius had been. The worst he complains of is that he is guarded by soldiers, and separated from his friends and books. Meanwhile he wrote an enormous number of letters. The undaunted courage of this really wonderful man never let him despair for a moment. He spent these years of exile encouraging his friends, consolidating his party and waiting for another turn of the wheel. He had to wait just eight years.

Ignatius was again Patriarch. Hitherto all we have heard of him has been good. He had bravely borne outrageous injustice and ill-treatment, his attitude towards the Roman See had been all that was correct, and now that see had restored to him his rights. Alas! at the end of his life Bulgaria proved too great a temptation for him, and because of these everlasting Bulgars he at last fell foul of his best friends. Was it that he now wanted to conciliate all his Byzantines by standing out for the aggrandizement of his see, or was there something in the air of Constantinople that made its Patriarch jealous of Rome? Ignatius, too, now begins to copy his rival and to try to filch Bulgaria from the Roman Patriarchate. He ordains an Archbishop for Bulgaria and persuades the Bulgar Prince to drive out the Latin hierarchy. One can imagine how edifying these quarrels between their mighty Christian neighbours must have been to the new converts. Pope Adrian II was dead; his successor was John VIII (872-882). John had prepared a bull of excommunication for Ignatius, when the news arrived in Rome that the Patriarch had ended his chequered life (October 23, 877). The Roman Church, forgetting this last episode, remembering only the trials he had so patiently borne and his otherwise unfailing allegiance to her, has canonized him. "It is very indulgent of her," says Mgr. Duchesne.¹ We may, perhaps, say

¹ *Égl. sép.* p. 216. St. Ignatius of Constantinople occurs in our Martyrology on October 23rd: "At Constantinople St. Ignatius, Bishop, who, when he had reproved Bardas the Cæsar for having repudiated his wife, was attacked by many injuries and sent into exile; but having been restored by the Roman Pontiff Nicholas, at last he went to his rest in peace."

rather that one offence, even against the rights of the Holy See, cannot outweigh the whole of a long and really saintly life. St. Ignatius was the type of a stern and God-fearing bishop, who was not afraid to rebuke the wickedness of an atrociously corrupt Court, even at the cost of his own fortunes. He was severe, perhaps even harsh, to his clergy, demanding from them in a bad time and at a luxurious and immoral city the ideal of earlier ages. That is why he was unpopular with some. But he was even more severe to himself. No one has questioned the austerity of his own life, and when he was persecuted he bore his trial with the firmness and dignity he had learnt during years of restraint in the Patriarch's palace. He stood out for the liberty of the Church against the State at a time when the worst Erastianism that has ever troubled the Church¹ was at its height, and he was loyal to the real authority in the Church, that of the first throne. We, too, may forget his one offence, the attempt upon Bulgaria, and remember him as one of the best bishops who ever sat on the soul-endangering throne of New Rome.

7. Photius lawful Patriarch (878-891).

Long before Ignatius died Photius had managed to gradually get back the favour of the Court. He was always servile to the civil authority. Now that he was deposed he professed to accept very respectfully the command of the Emperor. Then he began flattering the murderer of his former patron. Pride of good blood is a weakness upon which one may always count. So Photius set about to establish that Basil I was a gentleman. He worked up a mythical pedigree for him. As Basil was an Armenian by birth, he could not well be made to descend from King David, or Alexander, or Julius Cæsar; the one possibility was St. Gregory the Illuminator, the Apostle and national hero of Armenia. And so from St. Gregory he did descend, through King Tiridates, in a younger but true branch of the noble house

¹ The Catholic Church of course. Every schismatical body gets under the heel of the State at once. It is the unfailing result of schism: to be independent of the Pope, a National Church and what not, always works out as a substitution of the king for the Pope, nowhere more than in the Eastern Churches.

of the Arsacides. Moreover he discovered ancient prophecies that had foretold that some day a scion of this house should eclipse all his forbears and be the mightiest, the most generous, noble, and virtuous lord in the whole world, and his name would begin with a B. It was all forged upon old parchment.¹ One can imagine how pleased Basil was. What better teacher could the Prince Imperial, Constantine, have than the man who had made these beautiful discoveries and who, if he looked again, might perhaps find something about a boy whose name would begin with C? So Photius was brought back to Constantinople and made the Prince's tutor (876). Having now got a place at Court, he goes on improving his position, making himself popular and strengthening his party. The next move was a reconciliation with Ignatius. How far he persuaded Ignatius to make friends really is doubtful,² but he is never tired of insisting on the reconciliation and the affection now existing between him and his former enemy. So when Ignatius died every one cried out for Photius to succeed him. All his party, which had always been a very strong one, clamoured for their candidate, and the Court now wanted him too. Once more an Embassy sets out for Rome to ask the Pope's consent to Photius' succession. They assure him that the whole Byzantine Church and the Court want Photius. And John VIII agrees; he absolves Photius from all censures, and acknowledges him as Patriarch. So Photius after all became lawful bishop of the see he had so long coveted. This concession of the Pope has been much discussed. It has been said that it was a deplorable weakness, and showed the most hopeless want of character.³ It is true that Photius was very far from being the ideal man for such a place. On the other hand, the See of Constantinople now really was vacant, and the Byzantine bishops had the right

¹ This absurd story looks almost too crude to be possible; but it is all in Nicetas and in Symeon Magister (Mansi, xvi. 284). Cf. Herg. ii. 258, *seq.*

² There are two accounts. Some say that they became real and warm friends during the last years of Ignatius's life, others describe the whole thing as a fraud. Herg. ii. 280.

³ One of the explanations of the Pope Joan myth is, that it began as an irony on this very act of John VIII. She was inserted between Leo IV (847-855) and Benedict III (855-858) at just about this time.

of choosing whom they liked. The Pope was very anxious to get the Emperor's help against the Saracens, and it has always been the policy of the Roman See to concede whatever can be conceded without sin for the sake of peace. The Emperor in his letter had again protested his obedience to the Holy See.¹

As soon as he was recognized, Photius wanted a council to meet at Constantinople, really, of course, to counteract the effect of the one that had excommunicated him. There does not seem to have been much reason for yet another synod; but they persuaded John VIII that it would clear up all remains of schism, and greatly help to strengthen the union between East and West; so he gave in and sent three Legates, Peter, Cardinal Priest of the Church of St. Chrysogonus across the Tiber; Paul, Bishop of Ancona; and Eugene, Bishop of Ostia. They were told to acknowledge Photius, and to make every one else acknowledge him too, but to insist that Bulgaria belongs to the Roman Patriarchate. These Legates, however, behaved nearly as badly as Rodoald and Zachary of unhappy memory. The council was opened in the Hagia Sophia in November, 879. As soon as the Legates are announced, Photius goes up and kisses Cardinal Peter, and says: "God has brought you here. The Lord bless your efforts and your sacred persons, and may he graciously confirm the protection and care shown to us by our most holy Brother and Fellow-Bishop, our Spiritual Father, the most blessed Pope John."

All that, however, was only meant to look nice before the synod. Photius had long become confirmed in his hatred of Rome and the West, and he meant this council to declare open war against them. The church was full of his friends, and he had it all his own way. There were seven sessions; the Emperor came to the two last. Photius talks all the time. He violently abuses the Synod of 869, rakes up again his charges against the Latins, especially the Filioque charge, makes an anathema against any one who adds anything to the Creed, claims Bulgaria and quashes all the Acts of 869.² The Legates

¹ Quoted in Herg. ii. 383.

² The Acts of this council (the *Pseudosynodus Photiana*) in Herg. ii. Book 6, pp. 379-528.

agree to all this, and then they go back to Rome, and Photius sends the Acts of his council to the Pope for his confirmation. Instead, the Pope, of course, again excommunicates him. The schism had once more broken out. It lasted till Basil I's death (886). Photius and his friends had by now definitely taken up their line. They were a National Church, and, in spite of all their former appeals to Rome, now that Rome had pronounced against them, they were not going to recognize the authority of any foreigner. Let Old Rome look after the West, the Queen of the East was New Rome.

8. The End of Photius.

There is one more change before Photius dies. Again the wheel turns, and, after all his trouble, Photius once more has to go into exile. Basil I was succeeded by his son, Leo VI (886-912)—the eldest son, Constantine, was dead. And Leo, although he had been Photius's pupil, did not like his former tutor—it is difficult to know exactly why. So Photius is deposed and banished for high treason,¹ just as Ignatius had been thirty years before. Prince Stephen, the Emperor's younger brother, for whom no suitable provision had yet been made, becomes Patriarch (886-893)—a circumstance that probably explains the whole business. Whether Photius in exile again began making plans for his restoration we do not know; we do not even know where he was exiled. Suddenly, at this moment (886) the man who had made his name famous throughout Europe entirely drops out of history. He never got another chance, never reappeared in the city that had taken up his cause as her own. There is not even a letter that can be certainly dated as belonging to this second banishment. Where, in what distant monastery the old man ate out his heart during his last years, what bitter memories of his chequered career, what vain plans he

¹ He had conspired to depose the Emperor, and to put one of his own relations on the throne. These charges never mean anything. If the Court did not want a man, he was always condemned for treason on some absurd charge (aiding and abetting the Saracens was the favourite), and then banished, or blinded, or strangled—anything as long as he did not trouble Cæsar any more.

may still have been forming, or what regret for the awful harm he had done, he may, perhaps, now in his loneliness have felt, of all this we know nothing. The gorgeous life of the great city went on, feasting and solemn synods, then silent murders and torture in the vaults of the palaces, and, far away, the old Patriarch waited, hoped, perhaps repented, till he died (February 6, 891).¹

And then, after his death, gradually his people and his Church remembered what he had done for them. Rightly, all "Orthodox" Christians look upon Photius as the great champion of their cause. He delivered them from the tyranny of Rome, and because of that they have forgiven everything else. They have forgotten all his intrigues, his dishonesty, his miserable subservience to the secular power, the hopeless injustice of his cause. All the modern Greek or Russian knows of this long story is that Ignatius, a holy old man, resigned the patriarchate because of his great age, and was succeeded by St. Photius, greatest, wisest, best of Œcumenical Patriarchs, who valiantly withstood the tyranny of the Pope of Old Rome, and "broke the pride of the West." He appears always as a saint. In exile he is the most patient and heroic of confessors, on the patriarchal throne he is the grandest and justest of bishops; he is the most learned and orthodox of theologians, and always, whether prosperous or persecuted, the hero of their independence of Rome. They keep his feast on February 6th, and their hymns overflow with praise of him. He is "the far-shining radiant star of the Church," the "most inspired guide of the Orthodox," "thrice blessed speaker for God," "Wise and divine glory of the hierarchy," he who "broke the horns of Roman pride."²

The Catholic remembers this extraordinary man with very mixed feelings. Had he not given his name to the most disastrous schism in Church History, he would perhaps have been the last of the Greek Fathers. One cannot refuse to recognize his astounding learning. He was really a genius. There is no shadow of suspicion over his private life: he bore his troubles

¹ Even this date is not quite certain.

² Maltzew: *Menologion*, February 6th (i. 916, seq.).

very manfully and well. But still less can one forget the dishonesty with which he pushed his utterly unjust claim. "Whilst in writing himself to the Pope he explicitly acknowledges him as the head of the Church, at the same time, in the letter he composes for Michael to Nicholas, he directly denies the Primacy."¹ "The story of this man offers us two sides that must be well distinguished. The Christian conscience is deeply pained by the schism of which he was so entirely the cause, to which he gave a permanent theological basis, that he by every possible means fostered and nourished, misusing his magnificent gifts for shameful selfishness. But this will not prevent the historian from acknowledging his amazing learning, his rare merit as a theologian and philosopher, a philologist and historian—indeed, as a scholar of every branch of knowledge."² There is one short sentence of his predecessor, St. John Chrysostom, that Nicephorus the philosopher, Photius's friend, quotes. It stands as the reason of his final condemnation: "Nothing can hurt the Church so much as love of power."³

9. Reunion after Photius.

Once again after Photius had disappeared the quarrel between the Churches was patched up. At first Rome would not acknowledge the new Patriarch, Stephen, either; he had been intruded into the See of Constantinople just as much as Photius in 857, and he was only sixteen years old. Stephen tried to persuade the Pope (Formosus, 891–896)⁴ to recognize him, but apparently in vain. Stephen, in spite of his uncanonical age, had a double title to Byzantine canonization; he was a Patriarch and a Prince. So he is another of these astonishing saints (p. 103). Anthony II (893–895), Stephen's successor, held a synod in the presence of Roman Legates, and a union was arranged that lasted more or less for a century and a half. But it was rather a half-hearted union. Officially the

¹ Pichler: *Gesch. d. kirchl. Trennung*, i. 180.

² Herg. *Photius*, i. vi.

³ Chrys. Hom. ii. in Ephes. M.P.G. xi. 89.

⁴ The very worst time of all was just beginning at Rome. Nearly all the Popes now for about a century were horrible people.

two Churches were in communion. The Pope's name was restored to the Byzantine diptychs, and the many Latin monasteries in the East celebrated their Mass in communion with the local bishops. But the cleft was never completely healed after Photius. The Latins had always the profoundest distrust for Greek shiftiness, and the Byzantines were equally suspicious of Roman interference. Then came another imperial disturbance, in which the positions were reversed. The Emperor, Leo VI, married for the fourth time. A fourth marriage is forbidden by Byzantine Canon Law. So the Patriarch, Nicholas I (895-906), forbade the marriage. Leo, as usual, deposed the Patriarch. The Latin Church has never limited the number of wives a man may have, as long as all the others are properly dead ; so Pope Sergius III (904-911) allowed the marriage and approved of the deposition. The Latin custom is undoubtedly more in accordance with Scripture (1 Cor. vii. 39, which applies also to men) ; on the other hand Leo ought to have obeyed the Canon Law of his own Church. Perhaps he thought that as Cæsar Augustus and Lord of the World he could use the privilege of any part of the Empire left to him by his predecessor, Octavian Augustus. But it was certainly hard on the Patriarch to be deposed for having judged according to his own law. If only the Pope had taken the opposite line, the situation of Ignatius would have been exactly repeated.

However, Leo VI died in 912, and his successor, Constantine VII (Porphyrogennetos, 912-958) at once restored the Patriarch, and so this trouble blew over too. The Emperor Basil II (the Bulgar-slayer, 963-1025) sent Pope John XIX (1024-1033) a sum of money in 1024 to persuade him at last to acknowledge the title "Œcumenical Patriarch." John took the money, and seems to have been ready to do so. But a wave of indignation over the West (the title had so long been the watchword of the anti-Latin party in the East) and a stern letter from Abbot William of Dijon made him change his mind.


The union, then, during this interval between Photius and Cerularius was not a very firm one, and all the time there was a strong anti-papal party in the East, which had inherited all Photius's ideas, which already looked upon him as its chief hero

and saint, and which only waited for an opportunity of renewing his work. Yet the great mass of the faithful on either side knew nothing about the danger, and John Bekkos (John XI, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1275-1282) was not altogether wrong in saying afterwards that during this time there had reigned between East and West "perfect peace."¹ Thousands of Latin pilgrims went to the Holy Land, following the way by land down the Danube to Constantinople, and all the way they were received in the Eastern monasteries hospitably and kindly. Richard, Abbot of St. Vito in Lothringen, stops at Constantinople in 1026; he calls on the Emperor and the Patriarch, is courteously entertained by both, and receives from the Patriarch a relic of the true Cross and his blessing. Richard II, Duke of Normandy (996-1026, the grandfather of our Conqueror) sends large sums of money to the monasteries of Jerusalem and Mount Sinai to help pay the expenses of the Latin pilgrims they entertain. Equally pleasant were the relations of Greeks who came to us. St. Gotthardt, Bishop of Hildesheim, built a hospice on purpose for them. He says that he himself is not fond of Greeks, but that strangers must always be well treated for the sake of Christ. St. Gerard, Bishop of Toul, had numbers of Greeks and Scots in his diocese. He built special oratories for both, where they might worship God in the manner of their own countries. It was these Greeks at Toul who, little thinking what they were doing, taught their language to the man who was to be their foremost adversary, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida. In all these relations there is no hint of suspicion of heresy on either side. The Greeks heard the Latins sing the Filioque, apparently without emotion, and the Latins were quite content to see them leave it out.²

There still exists an interesting witness of these last friendly relations before the final disaster. On the road between the Alban Lake and Tusculum, where the first slopes of Monte Cavo

¹ Quoted by Allatius : *Græcia orth.* i. 37.

² For all this see L. Bréhier, *Le Schisme Or.* chap. i. Les rapports entre l'église grecque et l'église romaine depuis le début du x^e siècle jusqu'au milieu du xi^e siècle, pp. 1-34.



GROTTAFERRATA.

[To face page 169.]

rise out of the great Roman plain, there stands a monastery. Its grey walls and bastions rise out of the vineyards amid the olives and peach trees, while above, the tawny roofs cluster around the great church and the slim red Lombard tower. From the court of this monastery you may look across the haze of the Campagna to the long white line and to the great dome of the Eternal City. And the stranger who, turning back from the glare of the Italian sun, goes into the cool church will learn from the Greek "Hail Mary" written round the walls, from the great screen across the chancel, perhaps from the unfamiliar chant of the monks, that here, in the middle of the Latin world, he has found a Greek Laura.

In the 10th century St. Nilos was driven from his Abbey of Rossanum, in greater Greece, by the Saracens. He might have gone to any other part of the Greek world and he would have been eagerly received as a confessor of the faith and as an already famous Saint. But he feared lest his own people would make him too proud, so he came rather to the country of the Latins, thinking to live there unknown. But he was mistaken. The Franks knew how to be generous and chivalrous to a stranger in trouble. He came, with his sixty Greek monks, to the great Benedictine mother-house at Monte Cassino. The Benedictines, always the most hospitable of religious, met him, says his biographer, "as if St. Anthony had come from Alexandria, or their own great St. Benedict from the dead."¹ He was very surprised, still more so when the Abbot asked him to use their church to sing his Greek Office, alternately with the Latin *Opus Dei*, "that, according to the word of God, all should be complete in him." Sixty Greek monks then kept their hours regularly in the Benedictine Abbey Church. And St. Nilos, as generous as his hosts, wrote a hymn about their founder, and, forgetting the prejudices of generations, trained his tongue to pronounce their strange language, and when his own office was done, turned the unfamiliar leaves of a Latin psalter to join them in theirs. Then he talks with the Benedictines, and, naturally, the question of their different customs is raised. The Saint's attitude is very unlike that of the arrogant

¹ M.P.G. cxx, 124.

schismatics at Constantinople. "As for Saturdays," he says, "whether we eat, or you fast, we both do all things to the glory of God," and he advises them by all means to keep the custom of their fathers. Some time later, however, he and his monks leave the monastery, thinking that they cannot encroach on even Benedictine hospitality for ever, and they set out for Rome. The Pope (Gregory V, 996-999) and the Western Emperor (Otto III, 993-1002), who was then also at Rome, went out to meet the strangers beyond the walls, and received them with every possible honour and respect. And out there in the Campagna, at Grottaferrata (*κρυπτοφέρνη*) St. Nilos at last built a home for his wandering monks, and there he died, looking out towards Rome. Through all the changes that have taken place since, Grottaferrata has stood unchanged; not only has no Pope ever tried to destroy or Latinize it, it has always been a point of honour with them to endow it and to protect it. Still, after ten centuries, it stands within sight of the Roman walls, and still its monks sing out their Greek Office in the very heart of the Latin Patriarchate, while outside the Latin olives shelter its grey Byzantine walls.¹

Summary.

Prepared by the ill-feeling of ages, the Great Schism between East and West at last came in the 9th century. The Byzantine Government in 857 iniquitously deposed Ignatius, the lawful Patriarch of Constantinople, and intruded Photius into his place. Both Ignatius and Photius then appeal to Pope Nicholas I. The Pope sends Legates who, however, take bribes and accept all that has happened. Then the Pope, better informed, punishes his Legates, acknowledges Ignatius only, and excommunicates Photius as an intruded anti-bishop. Photius answers by striking the Pope's name off his diptychs. The feelings of both sides were very much further embittered by the question of the Bulgarian Church, which each claimed for his Patriarchate. In 867 Photius publishes a manifesto against the Pope and all

¹ For the history of Grottaferrata see A. Pellegrini (the present Abbot): 'Η ελληνική μονή τῆς κρυπτοφέρνης' (Syra, 1904).

the Latins, making five charges, of which the most important eventually was that we have added the *Filioque* to the Creed. In the same year Nicholas dies and a Palace revolution causes Photius's banishment and Ignatius's restoration. Peace was at once restored between Rome and Constantinople. In 869 the eighth general council is held, confirming Ignatius, again excommunicating Photius. Then, in 877, Ignatius dies and is succeeded by Photius, who is now recognized by the Pope (John VIII). Another council meets in 879, again attended by Roman Legates. But this council, entirely led by Photius, who now hated Rome as his own personal enemy, on the strength of the *Filioque* and the Bulgarian affair, again causes open schism, which lasts till, in 886, a new Emperor (Leo VI) again banishes Photius. He dies in exile in 891. After his death peace is restored between the Churches, although by this time there is already a strong anti-papal party at Constantinople. But the great mass of Christians on either side are reconciled, and have no idea of schism for one hundred and fifty more years.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHISM OF CERULARIUS

WE now come to the final rupture. If the story of Photius's usurpation and schism is discreditable to the Byzantine Church, that of Cerularius is far more so. It is the same, or an even worse story of aggression against Rome, and it is infinitely more gratuitous. In the case of Photius one can at any rate understand his motives. He wanted to be Patriarch, and, as the Pope would not have him, he would not have the Pope. In this schism of Cerularius one asks oneself continually : What is it all about? No one had attacked him ; there does not seem to have been the very least provocation ; the whole story looks as if he and his friends had no other motive than a love of schism for its own sake. A sketch of the three persons most concerned in this final separation will help to make the story clear.

1. The Pope, the Emperor, and the Patriarch.

The final blow came just in the middle of the 11th century. At that time the Roman Court was recovering from a very bad period. After John VIII (872-882), of whom we have heard in the last chapter, came Marinus (882-884). From his time corruption of every kind gradually spread over Rome, and things got steadily worse, till the German Popes begin with Clement II (1046-1047). During that long period of a century and a half there is hardly one, perhaps not one Pope, who was even an ordinarily good bishop. It is a long story of simoniacal elections, murder and violence of every kind, together with shameless lust. The Romans still remember the

three abominable women (*le donne cattive*), old Theodora, Marozia, and young Theodora, who from about 900 till 932 ruled Rome, filling the city with their abominations, and setting up one wretched boy after another as Pope. Meanwhile the Normans were plundering the coast of Italy, the Saracens had conquered Sicily, were ravaging the South of the Peninsula, and had come thundering even to the very gates of Rome. Then at last in the 11th century came the reaction. As for civil affairs, the great Saxon Emperors saw to them. Otto I (936-973) crushed the Magyars (at the river Lech in 935) and then came to set things right in Italy. He broke down all the little tyrants who were devastating the country, and once more joined all Germany, from Strassburg to the Oder, and Italy down to Gaeta in the Western Roman Empire. The reform of the Church was the work of the Cluniac monks. The Benedictine Abbey of Cluny (Cluniacum), in the diocese of Macon in Burgundy, had for its Abbot since 910 Berno, once Count of Burgundy. After Berno came St. Odo († 941). Cluny first reformed itself, going back to the strict keeping of St. Benedict's rule; then an enormous number of other Benedictine houses were founded under its obedience, and from them came all the great bishops and Popes who in the 11th century wiped out the shame of the past by their stern discipline and their own saintly lives. Greatest of all, the soul of the reform and of the whole Cluniac movement was Hildebrand, counsellor and director of seven Popes before he became one of the greatest of all as St. Gregory VII (1073-1085). The Pope who was concerned with the schism of Cerularius was the third of the German reforming Popes, and one of the many disciples of Hildebrand—St. Leo IX (1048-1054). He was Bruno, Count of Nordgau in Elsass, and a cousin of the Emperor Henry III (1039-1056). Then he became Bishop of Toul. When Pope Damasus II (1047-1048) died, the Emperor tried to appoint Bruno Pope.

It is not certain whether Bruno had ever actually been a Cluniac monk, but at any rate he stood very much under the influence of the Abbey and of Hildebrand. It was Hildebrand who persuaded him not to accept so uncanonical an appointment, so he went to Rome dressed as a pilgrim, and protested

to the Roman clergy that they were to hold a free election, and that if he were not lawfully chosen he would go back to Toul, his diocese. Then, when he had been canonically made Pope, he set about his task of a reform in root and branch. He sternly put down Simony, and all his life he fought against the incontinence of the clergy. These were the two radical vices spread throughout his patriarchate. Every year at Easter he held high session at Rome, and tried cases of these crimes. And on all sides pitilessly he deposed simoniacal clerks, no matter how high their place or great their influence. Metropolitans and archbishops, even the Emperor's own chaplain, one after another they had to go if they had bought their places with money. In this reform he had very great men to help him—Hildebrand, Hugo Abbot of Cluny, and St. Peter Damian, whose burning language about the horrible state of things that had gone before (*Liber Gomorrhianus*—the Book of Gomorrha) is as indignant and also as candid as should be that of a Saint. No Pope ever had a higher or a more uncompromising idea of the dignity and rights of his see than Leo IX. We shall see this from his correspondence with the Greeks. The views of Leo are already those of Gregory VII, and the foundation of all his polity is that, by the promise made by our Lord to St. Peter, the Roman See "must hold the primacy over the four sees, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople" (notice how he will not give Constantinople the second place; he is still true to the principle of Leo the Great, p. 42), "as well as over all the Churches of God throughout the whole world."¹ Leo IX was also concerned about the peace of Italy, and was always a determined enemy of the Norman pirates. These Normans were also the enemies of the Emperor in the East, who still had a precarious tenure over Southern Italy (*Magna Græcia*), a tenure that chiefly showed itself in attempts to assert the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople in those parts.² So the Pope seeks for an

¹ Ep. ad Michaellem et alios, Will, *Acta et Scripta*, p. 72.

² Leo the Isaurian (Leo III, 717-741) had already pretended to join the provinces of Calabria, Apulia, and Sicily to the Byzantine Patriarchate, see p. 46.

alliance with the Emperor against the common enemy, and treats with Argyros, a freebooting person who had got from Constantinople a commission to fight against the Normans.¹ The republic of Amalphi acknowledged the suzerainty of New Rome till 1073, and its doge was an Imperial "Proedros." There was, then, every reason for the Eastern Emperor and the Pope to remain friends at this time, and they both knew it. It was the Patriarch who forced the schism on them, very much against the will of both. But such a man as St. Leo IX was not likely to allow the rights of the Holy See to be defied. One is as glad that the cause of the Latins was represented by so great a man as Leo in 1054 as that Nicholas was Pope in 857.

The Emperor, Constantine IX (Constantine Monomachos, 1042-1054), was of a very different type. One of the many adventurers who climbed from a low place to the Roman throne, he had already been exiled for trying to usurp it, when he succeeded quite peaceably by marrying Zoe, the youngest daughter of Basil the Macedonian. She had already been twice married, and had made both her husbands Emperors (Romanos, 1028-1034, and Michael IV, 1034-1041). Now in 1042 she marries for the third time. Her husband, Constantine, had also been twice married, so that there was a double infringement of Byzantine Canon Law,² but this time no one made much difficulty. Constantine had been strong, learned, witty,³ and very beautiful; but soon after he became Emperor he was struck by paralysis, and remains henceforth well-meaning but hopelessly weak and frightened. The chief policy of his reign was to drive the Normans out of Magna Græcia, and for this he needed the help of both the Pope and

¹ Argyros was a Lombard adventurer, who had at first been on the Norman side. Then he went to Constantinople for five years (1046-1051), and came back, having changed his coat, as a Roman patrician, Duke of Italy, and commander-in-chief of the Emperor's forces. Cf. Gibbon, chap. lvi. (ed J. Bury, Methuen, 1898), vol. vi. p. 180, *seq.*

² Only two marriages were allowed.

³ He could imitate a goat bleating so perfectly that every one would hunt the room to find the quadruped (Psellos, i. p. 170). Plainly, the only place worthy of so varied talents was the Roman throne.

his Western rival. For every reason, then, he wanted to keep friends with the Latins, and, as we shall see, he was always strongly against the schism.

The cause of all the trouble was Michael Cerularius (Κηπουλάριος), the Patriarch (1043-1058). Like Photius, who was in all things his predecessor and model, Cerularius had not originally intended to be a priest. He was born of a great senatorial house of Constantinople, and began his career as a statesman. He seems to have had some place at Court, but in 1040 he was banished because of a plot to depose Michael IV. It was said that if the plot had succeeded Cerularius himself would have become Emperor.¹ They try to make him a monk, so as to cut off all further danger from him, but he absolutely refuses to take vows, until the suicide of his brother suddenly changes the attitude of his mind, and he freely enters a monastery. As soon as Constantine IX becomes Emperor he sends for Cerularius, who seems to have been already his friend, and greatly favours him. As he is a monk, and so cannot hold any of the great offices of state, Constantine invents a new rank on purpose for him. Cerularius is declared the Emperor's "familiar friend and guest at meals,"² and on the strength of this very vague position becomes the most powerful man in the Empire. But for a monk advancement must follow the usual road to a bishopric, so Cerularius is made Synkellos, that is practically secretary of the Patriarch. The Synkellos was always a bishop, and held a place in the Church of Constantinople second only to that of the Patriarch himself. It seems that at this juncture he was ordained bishop from having had no order at all, without having kept the Interstices, and that this is what the Roman accusation of being a neophyte means, which was afterwards made as often against him as it had been against Photius.³

The Patriarch Alexios (1025-1043) died on February 22, 1043, and at once Constantine appointed his friend to succeed him. There was no election; the Emperor went "like an

¹ L. Bréhier, *Le Schisme Oriental*, p. 56.

² ὁμωρόφιος καὶ ὁμοδιαίτος. Bréhier, *o.c.* p. 61.

³ Bréhier, *o.c.* p. 63.

arrow to the target" ¹ and chose Cerularius. That was, however, the end of their friendship, and the new Patriarch, as we shall see, was entirely ungrateful to his former patron. It is not difficult to form an opinion about Cerularius's character. Michael Psellos knew him well, and he wrote a funeral oration in his honour, ² as well as a detailed history of his own times, from 976 to 1077. ³ This history is (together with the acts of the Controversy published by Will) the chief source for the story of this time. From Psellos's account it is clear that the leading notes of Cerularius's character were a savage reserve, vindictiveness, and unbounded pride. He never forgave an injury, ⁴ he impressed the people by the austere dignity of his manner, and, as we shall see, on the patriarchal throne he considered himself to be placed far above the weak and paralytic Emperor, and behaved as if he held the first place in Christendom. His relaxation appears to have been the search for the philosopher's stone, ⁵ an occupation that had the advantage of being always interesting and never exhausted. It was then almost to be expected that two such characters as those of Leo IX and Michael Cerularius should clash; and yet the attack on the Latins made by the Patriarch was so wanton, so entirely unprovoked, and so especially ill-timed in the interests of the Empire, that there can be only one explanation of it. He must have belonged to the extreme wing of the anti-papal party at Constantinople—the party left by Photius—and must have been determined from the beginning on war with Rome on any or no pretext, as soon as ever he had a chance of declaring it.

2. The Schism.

It was in the midst of the "perfect peace" between the two halves of Christendom, in the year 1053, that a letter arrived

¹ Michael Psellos: Funeral Oration of Cerularius, ed. by C. Sathas (*Bib. med. ævi*, vol. iv. p. 326). Krumbacher: *Byz. Litt.* pp. 433-444.

² See last note.

³ Psellos's History has now been published as one of Methuen's *Byzantine Texts*. It is edited, with an Index Græcitis, by Professor C. Sathas (1898), and forms as good an introduction to Byzantine Greek and as entertaining a history as could be found.

⁴ Psellos, quoted by Bréhier, *o.c.* pp. 76-77.

⁵ Brehier, *o.c.* p. 72.

for a Latin bishop from one of his Greek brothers. As we shall see, this letter was the opening of a campaign already carefully thought out by Michael Cerularius. The letter was written by Leo, formerly a clerk of the Church of Constantinople, and now Metropolitan of Achrida,¹ and was addressed to John, Bishop of Trantum (Trani in Apulia).² But Leo says that he means it "for all the bishops of the Franks and for the most venerable Pope." It is an attack on all the customs of the Latin Church that are different from those of Constantinople. He is specially indignant at two—fasting on Saturdays and the consecration of unleavened bread. These two customs, he says, are totally unchristian; they are nothing but a return to Jewish superstition, the unleavened bread, because the Jews keep their Passover with it, and the fasting on Saturday he connects in some confused way with the Jewish Sabbath. This last idea is, of course, quite specially absurd. To fast, or at least abstain, on Saturday as well as on Friday was the custom in the West for many centuries. The abstinence is still the rule in Italy. Benedict XIV (1740–1758) declared that it does not bind in countries where a contrary custom has been prescribed against it,³ and now throughout the greater part of the Catholic Church the faithful have never even heard of it. The idea of the abstinence was that it should be kept during all the time that our Lord was dead and buried, from the day of the Crucifixion till he rises again on Sunday morning. It was never even remotely connected with the old Sabbath, which was a feast day (like our Sunday) on which no Jew has ever fasted. All through this story one is equally amazed at the impertinence of these Byzantines who will not mind their own business (no one ever asked them to use unleavened bread, and they could always eat as much as they liked on Saturday) and at the ridiculous charges they rake up. We may also note at once that throughout the quarrel that is coming now the question of the Filioque is hardly touched at all: their great grievance this time is our

¹ It was the Metropolitan See of Bulgaria p. 152.

² The letter is the first document published by Will, *o.c.*, the Greek text pp. 56–60; Card. Humbert's Latin version, pp. 61–64.

³ De Synodo, xi. 5, n. 5.

unleavened bread (Azyme). John of Trantum reads his letter and then sends it on to Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, asking what he thinks of it. This Cardinal Humbert will be the chief defender of the Latins throughout the quarrel. He was a Burgundian, and had been a monk at one of the Cluniac houses in Lothringen. Lanfranc says that he was a great scholar.¹ The Pope brought him out of his monastery, made him Bishop of Silva Candida² and a cardinal, and kept him at Rome as one of his own advisers. Cardinal Humbert then (being a Greek scholar) translates the letter into Latin and shows it to the Pope.

Meanwhile Cerularius, having sent off this declaration of war,³ proceeds to strengthen his position at home. It is most important to him to make sure that all the East is with him. To secure this he sends round to the other patriarchs and to various metropolitans a treatise written in Latin by a monk of Studium (the great Laura, once so faithful to Rome, pp. 65, 141, note 4), Niketas Stethatos (Pectoratus in Latin) against the Western Church.⁴ Niketas asks in this treatise how the Romans, "wisest and noblest of all races," can have fallen into such "horrible infirmities." He answers that certain Jews at the time of the Apostles had, for the hope of wicked gain, corrupted the pure Gospel at Rome. The "horrible infirmities" are Azyme bread for Mass, fasting on Saturday, and celibacy. This last point was specially offensive to a Pope who was standing out for the celibacy of clerks with all his might. The politeness of his reference to the Romans as the wisest and noblest of races does not at all accord with the general tone of his writing, for he goes on to apply to them St. Paul's words: "dogs, bad workmen,

¹ De Corp. and Sang. Dñi (M.P.L. cl. p. 409): "All who know him personally say that he is very learned in the knowledge of both divine and profane letters."

² Silva Candida was one of the suburban sees of Rome. Calixtus III joined it to the see of the Portus Tiberis in 1138. Humbert was Bishop of Silva Candida from 1057-1063. Gams: *Series episcoporum eccl. cath.* (Regensburg, 1873), ix.

³ There is no question but that Leo of Achrida sent his letter under orders from the Patriarch.

⁴ The text in Will, *o.c.* pp. 127-136. Krumbacher: *Byz. Litt.* pp. 154-155.

schismatics" (Phil. iii. 2), also "hypocrites and liars, who forbid marriage and abstain from foods that God has made" (1 Tim. iv. 1-3).

Cerularius's third move was to make it quite clear that he meant war to the knife. There were a number of Latin churches at Constantinople; the Emperor's Varangian guard, who were all Norsemen and Englishmen, had one, so also the merchants from Amalphi and the Magyars; there were some Latin monasteries, too, and the Papal Apocrisarius (Nuntius at the Court) had a Latin chapel in his house. Cerularius has all these churches shut up, even the Apocrisarius's chapel, in defiance of the universal respect paid to embassies, and he tells all the Latins in the city to stop being Azymites and to use the Byzantine rite. His Chancellor, Nikephoros, who of course believed in the Real Presence just as we do, bursts open Latin tabernacles and tramples on the Blessed Sacrament, because it is consecrated in Azyme.²

One wonders why Cerularius had waited so long before making his attack. He had become Patriarch in 1043. There had been no provocation meanwhile; nothing whatever had happened to irritate him. And now suddenly, after ten years, in 1053, he behaves like this. The only explanation is that he had been waiting for an opportune moment, when the Pope would be in as weak a position as possible. And that moment had come. The Pope's army had just been badly defeated by the Normans at Civitella (1053) and he himself had only escaped because of the reverence that these Normans felt for the person of St. Peter's successor. It is true that the Normans were even more the enemies of Byzantium; it is also true that a feeling of chivalry prevents decent people from launching a wanton attack on any one just when he is in trouble; but of course Cerularius cared nothing about that.

Leo IX then answers the letter of Leo of Achrida.³ He

¹ This is a very happy text for his purpose; only his own Church forbids monks' and bishops' marriages, and on the whole abstains from many more foods that God has made than we ever did.

² Will, pp. 164-165.

³ The text in Will, pp. 65-85.

evidently knows from whom the attack has come, for he begins : " Leo, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, to Michael of Constantinople and Leo of Achrida, Bishops." The leading idea of his letter is that peace and concord must reign throughout the Church. Woe to those who break it ! Woe to those who " with high-sounding and false words and with impious and sacrilegious hands cruelly try to rend the glorious robe of Christ, that has no stain nor spot." He most emphatically asserts the primacy of his see.¹ He will not deign to defend the practices attacked by Leo of Achrida : " Do you not see," he says, " how impudent it is to say that the Heavenly Father has hidden from Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the proper rite of the visible sacrifice ? " He quotes all the Petrine texts, and he also makes much of the *Donatio Constantini*.² For this he deserves no blame, since no one suspected its authenticity till the 15th century. And he turns the tables on the aggressors by showing how often heresies, and real heresies, have come from Constantinople, and have been condemned by Rome. He mentions Eusebius of Nicomedia, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Pyrrhus, and others, showing that, instead of being corrected by the East, Old Rome has continually saved the Church from the errors of New Rome. With regard to Cerularius's violence to the Latin churches, he points out that no one has ever thought of troubling the many Byzantine churches and monasteries in the Latin Patriarchate. The letter is neither immoderate nor offensive, and the Pope's anger is certainly not greater than the wanton attack on his Church deserved. He also shows his appreciation of the situation by addressing it to Cerularius as well as to Leo of Achrida, and by at once coming to the root of the whole matter, the Roman Primacy. On receipt of this letter, Cerularius seems for a moment to have wavered from his scheme and to have made some overtures of peace. His answer is not extant, but it is referred to in several documents. He writes to Peter of

¹ The quotation at p. 174 is from this letter.

² A document purporting to be drawn up by Constantine giving Pope Sylvester the Lateran Palace and *civil* authority over Rome, Italy, and all the West. It is really a forgery of the 8th century.

Antioch that he had proposed an "alliance" with the Pope, and he himself says why: "That he might be well-disposed and friendly to us concerning the help he is to give us against the Franks (he means the Normans)." ¹ Evidently for a moment the importance of the war against the Normans overshadowed in his mind the great plan of breaking with Rome.

But this attitude did not last long, and even while it did last his overweening pride made him suggest what he wanted in the most impossible way. His own word, alliance (σύμβασις), shows his point of view. It was to be a treaty drawn up between two equal and independent Powers, or rather not equal, for he had arrived at thinking himself a far greater man than the Pope. "You write to us," answers Leo IX, "that if we make your name honoured in the one Church of Rome, you will make our name honoured throughout the whole world. What monstrous idea is this, my dear brother?" ² To have written such nonsense to the Pontiff who was obeyed from Sicily to Norway, and from Poland to the Atlantic, seems, if it were not meant just as another insult, to be the very madness of pride. The Pope's answer to this proposed "alliance" is: "So little does the Roman Church stand alone, as you think, that in the whole world any nation that in its pride dissents from her is in no way a Church, but a council of heretics, a conventicle of schismatics and a synagogue of Satan." He solemnly warns Cerularius against that pride that has always been so great a temptation to the Patriarchs of Constantinople. "How lamentable and detestable is that sacrilegious usurpation by which you everywhere boast yourself to be the Universal Patriarch." . . . "Let heresies and schisms cease. Let every one who glories in the Christian name cease from cursing and wounding the holy apostolic Roman Church." But he still hopes for peace and he ends: "Pray for us, and may the holy Trinity ever keep your honourable Fraternity." ³

With this letter and with an exceedingly friendly one to the Emperor, "Our honourable and beloved son in Christ and glorious Augustus," ⁴ the Pope sends three Legates to Constan-

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 174.

² Ibid. p. 91.

³ Ibid. pp. 89-92.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 85-89.

tinople. They were Cardinal Humbert, Cardinal Frederick, the Chancellor of the Roman Church, Leo's cousin¹ and Peter, Archbishop of Amalphi. It was the last Embassy that went from Rome to Constantinople.² Meanwhile the Emperor Constantine IX was exceedingly annoyed at the whole disturbance. He did not want a schism in the least; he did not care what sort of bread the Latins use, nor what they eat on Saturday, he wanted the Pope to help him fight the Normans. So he still hopes it will all be made up; he receives the Legates with great honour and lodges them in one of his own palaces. But Cerularius has quite recovered from his idea of an alliance with the Pope; the letter that these Legates brought for him doubtless helped the recovery. He is now very angry at their behaviour. The immemorial custom is for a Papal Legate to take the position of the Pope himself. He is the Pope's representative and *alter ego*. We have seen (Chap. II, pp. 75-81) that the Legates presided at general councils, taking rank before all the patriarchs. But Cerularius wants these Legates to sit below, not only himself, but all his Metropolitans too. That they refuse to do so, that they do not prostrate themselves before him and that they bear their crosiers in his diocese are the injuries he complains of to Peter of Antioch.³ Because of these three points he describes their conduct as "so great insolence, boastfulness, rashness," and says that they have an "arrogant proud spirit" and are "stupid."⁴ Several weeks pass in discussion. Cardinal Humbert composes a "Dialogue between a Roman and a Constantinopolitan," in which he quite temperately answers their charge of Judaism in our customs;⁵ and an answer to the treatise of Niketas Stethatos.⁶ This answer is not temperate. He writes as violently as any Byzantine, and

¹ He afterwards became Pope himself—Stephen IX, 1057-1058.

² That is, the last ecclesiastical embassy. There were civil negotiations after the schism.

³ Will, *o.c.* p. 177. Legates always bear their crosiers wherever they go as Legates. They are for the time delegated with a share in their master's universal jurisdiction.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid. *o.c.* pp. 93-126. There are one or two sharp expressions.

⁶ Ibid. *o.c.* pp. 136-150.

heaps up abusive epithets. Niketas is no monk, but an epicure, who ought to live in a circus or house of bad repute, a dog, an abominable cynic, and is made of the same stuff as the Mohammedans. Incredible as it seems, this language converted Niketas. He publicly retracts his book and curses all the enemies of the Roman Church, becoming "henceforth our friend."¹ There seems no doubt that the Emperor made him do so. Suddenly Pope Leo IX dies (April 19, 1054), just as Nicholas I had died, in the middle of the negotiations. He was not succeeded till a year later by Victor II (1055-1057). Cerularius now refuses to see the Legates and will have nothing more to do with them;² he had already taken the final step by striking the Pope's name off his diptych.³ This was open schism.

The Legates then at last prepare a bull of excommunication. They are still on quite good terms with the Emperor, and they are very careful to say nothing against the Byzantine Church.⁴ "As far as the pillars of the Empire are concerned, and its wise and honoured citizens, this city is most Christian and Orthodox." "But we," they go on, "not bearing the unheard-of offence and injury done to the holy Apostolic and first See, wishing to defend in every way the Catholic faith, by the authority of the holy undivided Trinity and of the Apostolic See, whose Legates we are . . . declare this: That Michael, patriarch by abuse, neophyte, who only took a monk's habit by fear and is now infamous because of many very bad crimes, and with him Leo, called Bishop of Achrida, and the Sacellarius of the said Michael, who with profane feet trampled on the sacrifice of the Latins and all their followers in the aforesaid errors and presumptions shall be Anathema Maranatha . . . with all heretics, and with the devil and his angels, unless they repent. Amen."⁵

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 151. Humbert's "Short account of the things done by the Legates of the Holy Apostolic Roman See in the imperial city."

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. *o.c.* p. 178.

⁴ Ibid. *o.c.*: the text of the bull, pp. 153-154.

⁵ The offences of (not the Eastern Church but) Michael and his party are said to be that they commit simony, make eunuchs, rebaptize Latins, deny all true Church or sacrifice or baptism outside their own Greek body, allow priests' marriage, curse the old law of Moses, deny that the Holy Ghost

Now that the crash is coming, one asks oneself what else the Legates could have done. They had waited long enough, and if ever a man clearly showed that he wanted schism it was Cerularius. He had already excommunicated the Pope by taking his name off the diptychs. We should note that this is the only sentence that the Roman Church pronounced against the Eastern Communion. She has never excommunicated it as such, nor the other patriarchs. If they lost her communion it was because they too, following Cerularius's example, struck the Pope's name from their diptychs.

It was Saturday, July 16, 1054,¹ at the third hour (9 a.m.). The Hagia Sophia was full of people, the priests and deacons are vested, the Prothesis (preparation) of the holy Liturgy has just begun. Then the three Latin legates walk up the great church through the people, go in through the Royal Door of the Ikonostasis and lay their bull of excommunication on the altar. As they turn back they say: *Videat Deus et iudicet*.² The schism was complete.

It is always rather dangerous to claim that misfortunes are a judgement of God, and indeed no one could have any thought of satisfaction at the most awful calamity that ever happened to Christian Europe. At the same time one realizes how, from the day the Legates turned back from the altar on which they had laid their bull, the Byzantine Church has been cut off from all intercourse with the rest of Christendom, how her enemies gathered round this city nearer and nearer each century, till at last they took it, how they overturned this very altar as Cerularius had overturned the Latin altars, took away the great church as he had taken away ours, and how since that the

proceeds from the Son, say that all leavened matter has a soul, will not baptize babies who die a week after they are born, will not receive into communion shaven clerks. These offences are not said to be all heretical. One accusation (priests' marriage) is only a rather unworthy reprisal. But the Legates make it quite clear that the real reason for their bull is Cerularius's open schism.

¹ Bréhier's date (July 15th) is wrong (p. 117). Card. Humbert says: "XVII Kal. Augusti adierunt ecclesiam sanctæ Sophiæ . . . iam hora tertia diei sabbati." Will, pp. 151-152.

² Will, *l.c.*

successors of the man who would not bow to the Roman Pontiff have had to bow to, have had to receive their investiture from, the unbaptized tyrant who sits on the throne of Constantine ; one realizes this and sees that the words of the Legates were heard and that God has seen and judged.)

3. After the Schism.

The final breach had now come. It is because of these events, culminating in the scene of that Saturday morning, that a hundred millions of Christians to-day have no communion with the Catholic Church. The Legates seem to have still hoped that there would be no breach between the Churches. They had only excommunicated Cerularius and his party. The Emperor was still warmly on their side ; had he been strong enough to get rid of the Patriarch the whole affair might have blown over. But he was hopelessly weak in his paralysis, and Cerularius was already by far the strongest man in the Empire. Two days later the Legates set out for Rome. Constantine IX gives them splendid presents for the Pope and for the great monastery of Monte Cassino, always specially favoured by the Eastern Emperors. Hardly were they gone when Cerularius sends after them to call them back ; he is now prepared to treat with them. What did he really want ? There seems no doubt that he meant to have them murdered. Reckless and useless as such a crime would have been, the evidence is conclusive. Cardinal Humbert says so quite plainly : " Michael tried to make them come to the Church of Holy Wisdom the next day as if to a council, so that—he having already shown the people a copy of the bull, which he had corruptly translated—they should there be massacred. But the prudent Emperor, foreseeing this, would not allow the meeting unless he himself were present." ¹ The Emperor keeps the Legates carefully guarded in his own palace and undertakes to protect their persons whatever happens. Then Cerularius refuses to meet them (on these terms) after all. So they set out again for Rome and this time arrive there quite safely. The Patriarch is now furious with the

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 152.

Emperor and excites a tumult against him. That this revolution was the work of Cerularius is attested by Humbert¹ and practically confessed by himself. Poor Constantine, terribly frightened, sends an Embassy to the Patriarch, treating with him as with an independent Power, or rather as with a superior, and writing him an abject letter, which Michael himself scornfully describes as "supplicating."² He begs Cerularius not to be hard on him, says that all the trouble caused by this Legation was the fault of Argyros (!), is quite prepared to let Argyros be put in gaol (if they can catch him) and the bull be publicly burned; he solemnly excuses himself for having let the Legates get away unhurt "because of their character as ambassadors."³ This letter plainly shows who was responsible for the revolution and what it was that Cerularius wanted to do to the Legates. The Patriarch then holds a synod against the Latins and their bull; and he is so pleased to see the Emperor's humiliation before himself, that he publishes his letter at the end of the Acts of the synod,⁴ not realizing how he thereby makes his own crimes known to all future ages. In this same synod he reproduces the old Encyclical of Photius with all its charges against the Latins and excommunicates us all.

Meanwhile the great question was: What would the other Eastern Patriarchs do? It was, indeed, almost a foregone conclusion that they, who were all Greeks, brought up under the now overwhelming influence of Constantinople, would side with her, just as all the Latin bishops stood by Rome. The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem were almost negligible quantities. They sat under the Moslem with their little flocks; they, of course, violently hated the Copts and Jacobites who were better disposed to the Mohammedan Government, and as Melkites who had always stood out for the "Imperial" Church they turned their eyes with reverent piety to that distant Imperial city where reigned the Orthodox Cæsar and, in happy freedom, the Orthodox Patriarch, whom they had now long looked upon as their chief. So when Cerularius sent them

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 152.

² Ibid. p. 166.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 155-168. See also Bréhier, *o.c.* pp. 120-125, who is convinced that Cerularius meant to have the Legates killed.

round an order to strike the Pope's name off their diptychs,¹ they quietly obeyed.

The position of the Patriarch of Antioch was just then more fortunate. In 968 the Roman armies had conquered back his city and so he was again free under a Christian Government, although most of his Patriarchate was gone. Both sides then try to win Peter of Antioch.² There are very few people in this history for whom one feels so much sympathy as with this Peter. He had all the prejudices of his race. He cannot bear Latins; he thinks we are barbarous, ignorant, gross in our habits, not fit to be compared with the pure Christians and refined "Romans" who enjoy the blessings of the Imperial State and the Greek tongue. And yet he dreads schism more than anything else in the world and he hopelessly tries to make excuses for us to Cerularius, and implores him to be patient with our unpleasant ways, and at any rate, whatever happens, not to make a schism.

Only two years before the schism, in 1052, he had, as usual, sent to announce his election to Pope Leo IX. He had, as usual, acknowledged the Roman Primacy.³ Leo answered with a letter as courteous and friendly as any could be.⁴ He makes the most graceful parallel between the two Petrine Churches: "Your Apostolic See has addressed our Apostolic See." He remembers that "it was in the great Antioch that Christians were first named." Touching an old grievance, he says that "Antioch must keep the third place," and that "we have heard that certain people are trying to diminish the ancient dignity of the Antiochene Church." That means, of course, the ambition of Constantinople, by which Antioch would sink to the fourth place. Unfortunately, the Pope's letter got lost on the way,

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 178.

² Peter III of Antioch began his reign in 1052. The date of his death is unknown. Lequien: *Oriens. Christ.* ii. 754.

³ Will, *o.c.* p. 169. Leo's answer says: "We see that you do not wander from the decree of all the holy Fathers, according to whom the holy Roman Apostolic Church is the head of all Churches throughout the world, and that to her the greater and more difficult causes of all Churches must be referred." Peter's letter is no longer extant.

⁴ Will, *o.c.* pp. 168-171.

and afterwards Peter complains, somewhat sulkily, that the Pope had never answered him.¹ When the quarrel began Leo made Dominic, Patriarch of Venice,² write to Peter. This letter,³ too, is almost excessively moderate. Dominic is very polite to the "eminent Patriarch of the most high and holy Church of Antioch and great and Apostolic man." He, too, refers to the Petrine succession of the see "which we know to be the sister of our mother the Roman Church." He tells him all about Leo of Achrida's letter, and explains that, if the Latins prefer to use Azyne, they by no means intend to disparage the Eastern use of leaven. "Because we know that the sacred mixture of fermented bread is used and lawfully observed by the most holy and Orthodox Fathers of the Eastern Churches, we faithfully approve of both customs, and confirm both with a spiritual explanation." He thinks that leavened bread typifies the hypostatic union, and Azyne our Lord's purity. One cannot sufficiently admire the reasonableness and toleration of Rome at a time when Cerularius was calling us Jews, and our Holy Eucharist "mud."⁴ Dominic's last argument is pathetically meek: "If, then, our offering of Azyne bread is not the Body of Christ, we are all of us cut off from the source of life." Meanwhile, Peter of Antioch had also heard from Constantinople, and he now embarks on a hopeless career as a peace-maker. He answers Dominic quite kindly, although he will not let him be a patriarch, since there can only be five, and he himself is the only person who has a quite certain right to the title.⁵ He says that "the most holy Patriarch of Constantinople does not think you to be bad men, nor cut off from the Catholic Church . . . but he thinks your faith halting in this one point only, in the oblation of Azyne."⁶

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 228.

² His official title was "Patriarch of Gradus and Aquileia." These were merged into Venice, and already then he was commonly called Patriarch of Venice. Aquileia was not formally abolished till 1751, by Benedict XIV.

³ Will, *o.c.* pp. 205-208.

⁴ This was his favourite amenity—"dry mud" (Will, p. 105).

⁵ Will, *o.c.* pp. 208-228. This is the letter quoted above, p. 46, note 2.

⁶ This shows how completely the question of the Filioque had retired to the background just then.

Cerularius, however, to make sure of Peter's support, now embarks on a career of lying. The first lie is that the Pope's name has not appeared on the Byzantine diptychs since the sixth general council (680), and (for he now imagines himself quite a Pope, with jurisdiction over the other patriarchs) he orders Peter to remove it from his diptychs at once, and to see that the same is done at Alexandria and Jerusalem.¹ This brazen falsehood is at once refuted by Peter. In his answer² he first quotes Cerularius's words, and goes on: "I am covered with shame that your venerable letter should contain such things. Believe me, I do not know how to explain it, for your own sake, especially if you have written like this to the other most blessed patriarchs."³ He then mentions all the Popes who, since 680, have been specially revered at Constantinople—Agatho most of all—and he says: "When I went to Constantinople forty-five years ago, I myself heard the Pope mentioned in the holy mysteries with the other patriarchs by the Lord Patriarch Sergius of holy memory."⁴

But the unblushing Cerularius has many more lies to tell. He sends Peter this amazing account of what had happened in the affair of the Legates: the Legates had not been sent by the Pope at all, but by Argyros.⁵ Argyros, who was still freebooting about Italy and pretending to fight the Normans, and whom Cerularius for some reason always hated, seems to have been a general scapegoat. Then the Legates who came, fraudulently pretending to be sent by Rome, were themselves disreputable persons; one of them had once been Bishop of Amalphi, but had been turned out from that see for just causes, and had wandered about Italy for five years (this was pure fiction); another pretended to be an archbishop, but no one could find where his diocese was (Cardinal Humbert: his diocese was *Silva Candida*); the third was a sham chancellor. It is tedious to repeat the pages of falsehood he sends to Antioch, how the Legates had forged letters, broken open seals,⁶ and how they had excommunicated all the Easterns because they neither

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 178.

² P. 190.

³ P. 175.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 189, *seq.*

⁵ P. 193.

⁶ Pp. 175-177.

shave the beard, nor use Azyme nor say the Filioque.¹ By this time Cerularius has found some more grievances against us besides the three chief ones (Azyme, Saturday fast, and celibacy). He bitterly complains of these customs, too : Latin clerks shave the beard, eat unclean food, their monks eat meat on Wednesday, they say the Filioque, and sing in Mass "One holy Lord Jesus Christ in the glory of God the Father through the Holy Ghost"; they have a kiss of peace in Mass, their bishops wear rings, do not venerate relics, despise the Eastern Fathers, will not pray to St. Gregory of Nazianzum, St. Basil, or St. John Chrysostom, and their bishops go to war.² Of all this amazing list of nonsense, some statements are sheer falsehoods, as that Latins do not venerate relics nor pray to the Saints he names.³ In some cases one simply cannot, with the best will, make out what he means: why he objects to bishops' rings, shaving, or the verse at the end of our Gloria, unless on the general principle that the whole world must conform to Constantinople, down to the smallest trifles. One accusation (about our eating food Levitically unclean) is too ridiculous, as coming from the man who was always accusing us of Judaism. But in one point he has happened to hit on a real abuse—the 11th-century Latin bishop was too much disposed to go a-fighting. Peter, in his answer, agrees about the Filioque, but points out how absurd the other charges are.⁴ In the case of the verse in the Gloria he reminds Cerularius that the Eastern Liturgies contain almost exactly the same words.⁵ As for relics, the Romans have the very bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul, and "Adrian the Roman Pope presided at the Seventh Synod (against the Iconoclasts)." "And we have seen the Frank pilgrims in our venerable churches give every honour and reverence to sacred pictures."⁶ But, above all, Peter of Antioch dreads schism, and the pathetic words, with which he implores Cerularius not to make one, end

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 186. The Roman Church has never asked the Easterns to do any of these things.

² *Ibid.* pp. 180-183.

³ In the Latin Church St. Gregory Nazianzum has his feast on May 9th, St. Basil on June 14th, St. John Chrysostom on January 27th. All three are honoured as Doctors of the Church.

⁴ Will, *o.c.* pp. 193-197.

⁵ P. 198.

⁶ P. 202.

their correspondence. He writes from no love of Latins. "They are our brothers," he says, "although their rusticity and stupidity often make them behave indecently. We must not expect from these barbarians the same perfect manners as we find among our civilized people."¹ But he says: "I beg you, I implore you, and in spirit I embrace your sacred feet and entreat Your Divine Beatitude to give way and to accommodate itself to circumstances. For it is to be feared that you, in trying to heal these differences, may only make a schism, which is worse, and that in trying to lift them up you may cause a great calamity. Consider what would certainly happen if that great first and Apostolic See be divided from our holy Churches—wickedness would spread everywhere, and the whole world would be upset, the kingdoms of all the earth would be shaken, everywhere would be much woe, everywhere tears."²

We have every reason to suppose that Peter never did go into schism; he had plainly refused to strike the Pope's name from his diptychs once, and we see how strongly he feels about the evil of breaking the communion of "that great first and Apostolic See." He died the last Catholic Patriarch of Antioch of the old line; may he rest in peace. His attitude was typical of the older Eastern tradition with its utter ignorance of anything outside the Empire, even of the Latin language, its absurd idea that "Franks" were all miserable savages,³ its pathetic self-complacency, and yet its firm conviction that for no reason may Catholic unity be broken.

4. The End of Cerularius.

It would still remain a mystery why Cerularius should have been so absolutely determined to break with Rome at any cost,

¹ Will, *o.c.* p. 198. Peter, by the way, could not read a word of Latin. He had to send the Pope's letter to Constantinople to have it translated. He could not find any one at Antioch who could do so (p. 204). See above, p. 89.

² Will, *o.c.* pp. 202-203.

³ The idea is quite simple: the people whom Julius Cæsar had fought were savages. *Atqui* the "Romans" in the East represent Cæsar and his Romans; Franks in the West are the descendants of the savages. *Ergo*. The ignorance of Latin seems rather strange, but perhaps Peter thought that Julius had talked Byzantine Greek. His Roman Emperor did.

why he should have cared to heap up lies and attempt murder, apparently for no possible object but just the pleasure of being in schism, did not his future career give the clue to the whole scheme. He was by far the strongest and most popular man in Constantinople, and he wanted to be the recognized head of the Empire. At one time later he seems to have tried to join the rank of Emperor and Patriarch in his own person, and when that plan failed his idea was to set up a kind of theocracy, in which the State should be the humble vassal of the Church, and the head of the Church the acknowledged over-lord of the head of the State. It was the exact reverse of the Erastianism that, as a rule, flourished unchecked in the Eastern Empire, a sort of concrete case and actual practice of the Utopia of which Gregory VII and Boniface VIII dreamed. The breach with Rome was only a means, the first step in this plan. Cerularius could easily manage to be the head of the Eastern Patriarchs, but he knew it was hopeless to expect the Roman Pope to submit to him. So he had definitely to cut the tie between the Eastern and Western Churches—any excuse must serve, for no one could possibly really care about the ludicrous accusations he brought against us.¹ Then, unquestioned master of a great homogeneous ecclesiastical body, he could and did proceed to fight for civil supremacy as well.² Only here the fortune of war turned against him and he fell. He had already shown Constantine IX that he was the greater man of the two. Constantine after that was very careful not to annoy the Patriarch again. He died in 1055 and was succeeded by old Theodora, his wife's sister, the last descendant of Basil the Macedonian. Cerularius, says Psellos, "tried to rule over the Empress."³ When she died (1056) Michael VI (1056-1057) succeeded. But Michael wanted to reign independently of his over-lord, so Cerularius, who is

¹ One wonders, however, why he did not stick to the *Filioque* grievance and make the most of that. It would have made a far better case than the nonsense he thought of. However he was certainly no theologian, and probably did not realize this. He was never anything like so clever a man as Photius.

² This is Bréhier's view, *o.c.* pp. 209-215: *Les causes politiques du schisme*.

³ Fun. Oration of Cerularius, ed. Sathas, p. 357.

the kingmaker of the Eastern Empire, again rouses the people, overturns Michael, goes himself to cut off his hair and make him a monk, and sets up Isaac Komnenos (1057-1059) in his place. At first Isaac, who knows quite well to whom he owes his place, is very docile. The year 1058 was the time of Cerularius's greatest power. The Emperor let him rule as he liked in the Church and the Palace; he appointed the officers of state and at last succeeded in being the only real sovereign of the Empire.¹ "Losing all shame," said Psellos afterwards, "he joined royalty and priesthood in himself; in his hand he held the cross, while from his mouth imperial laws came."² But gradually Isaac got tired of being the Patriarch's vassal and wanted to really reign. So once again Cerularius works up a revolution. His language to the Emperor lacked respect: "You beast," he said, "I made you and I will crush you."³ However he did not succeed this time. He seems to have meant to get himself actually crowned Emperor after this revolution.⁴ But Isaac was too quick for him. Before Cerularius had time to arrange his insurrection he was arrested and tried for high treason (1059). It was Psellos, his old friend and future panegyrist, who was the advocate for the crown, and the comparison of his indictment with the funeral oration he pronounced when Cerularius was dead and had to be glorified is an interesting example of Byzantine honesty. Now everything had to be made as black as possible, and so besides the accusation of treason, which was a true bill, Psellos heaps up every kind of absurd charge. Cerularius was guilty of Hellenism⁵ and Chaldaism—that is, heathen witchcraft; he had invoked "material ghosts." (It is true that when

¹ He now began to wear purple shoes, one of the official privileges of the Emperor: Bréhier, *l.c.*

² Quoted by Bréhier, *o.c.* p. 275.

³ Ἐὼ σε ἔκτισα, φούρνε, ἐὼ ἵνα σε χαλάσω (Bréhier, p. 279). A beautiful example of vulgar 11th-century Greek. Ἐὼ is, of course, ἐγώ. φούρνος is a baker's oven. Notice ἵνα with the subj. already = future. I do not know why he called Isaac a baker's oven. Bréhier translates it "brute."

⁴ See Bréhier, p. 281.

⁵ Hellenism still means heathenism. These Greeks, of course, all called themselves Romans—*Ρωμαῖοι*—that is citizens of the Roman Empire.

he had given up the philosopher's stone he had developed a polite taste for spiritualist séances.) Also his language was so vulgar that he made people blush ; in short he was "impious, tyrannical, murderous, sacrilegious, and unworthy." But Cerularius did not live to suffer the capital punishment that probably awaited him. While he was being taken, strongly guarded, to Madytos¹ he died (1059). At once, then, his apotheosis begins.² Now that he is no longer dangerous to any one the Emperor affects much regret for all that had happened. His body is brought with great pomp to Constantinople, and is buried in the monastery of the Holy Angels. And gradually the people forget everything evil that he did and transform him into a saint. A yearly panegyric is instituted in his memory, and the same Psellos who had brought the charges against him, preaching before the Emperor, describes his former victim as the wisest, holiest, most persecuted of men.³ Cerularius had not succeeded in his plan of setting himself up as the head of a great theocracy ; but he had done a far greater work and one that still lasts, he had definitely established the schismatical Eastern Church.

At the end of all this story of the schism one remark needs to be made. The sometimes almost incredible facts are not in dispute. Cornelius Will's *Acta et Scripta* are a collection of contemporary letters and reports, from which each step of the story is made plain, and from which, as a matter of fact, all this account has been written. And people who have studied the matter know it all. Philip Meyer's article on "Cerularius" in the great German Protestant Encyclopædia of Theology,⁴ for instance, says of the quarrel between the Churches : "This time it was Michael who arbitrarily took it up again, just at a time when the Court of Byzantium and the Pope had enough reason for an

¹ In the Chersonesos on the Hellespont. There was a shipwreck on the way, and though he got ashore he died from its effects.

² As soon as he was dead he appeared to the Bishop of Madytos radiant in his patriarchal vestments, only (being a ghost) he had to flee away at day-break (Fun. Oration, p. 374).

³ This is the funeral oration already quoted.

⁴ *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Herzog u. Hauck), Leipzig, vol. iii. (1897), pp. 620-621.

alliance in the Norman war." . . . "Michael violently suppressed the Latin rite, that was used in many monasteries and churches over there, and in 1053 sent, in a letter to the Bishop of Trani in Apulia, a regular declaration of war against the Roman Church." When the Legates came "Michael himself rejected their advances. Then the Legates took the last step, and on July 16, 1054, laid an elaborate bull of excommunication on the altar of the Sophia Church, which, with prudent respect for the Court, heaped up curses, abuse, and heretical names against the Patriarch, his followers, and the practices of his Church." Afterwards Cerularius "was dishonest enough to represent the whole Embassy as having not been sent by the Pope." "As far as hatred and passion goes, both sides may have been about equal; but in chivalrous pride and judgement the representatives of the Roman Church were superior to their adversary." "As the defender of Greek Orthodoxy, Michael, however, was remembered by his Church with great honour, although without much desert, as far as his mind and character are concerned." So far a scholar who, in spite of his prejudice against Rome, at any rate knows his subject. But the small text-books of history, the handbooks and compendia that go about in England, have nothing to say about the whole quarrel except, perhaps, that Photius refused to acknowledge the Pope's assumed primacy, and that the Eastern Church under Cerularius finally threw off the yoke of Rome. All that Mr. Hutton (as one instance out of many) in a little book on Constantinople¹ has to say is: "Two great names embody in the East the final protest against Roman assumption." "Photius . . . owed his throne to an election which was not canonical." "The papal claim to decide between two claimants to the patriarchate was fiercely resented" (! both had formally appealed to Rome). "The position which Photius defended with skill and vigour in the 9th century was reasserted by Michael Cerularius in the 11th. He regarded the teaching of the West on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, says Psellus, as an intolerable heresy; and he was prompt to reassert jurisdiction over the Churches of Apulia, now

¹ In Dent's "Mediaeval Towns" series (1900), pp. 86-87.

conquered by the Normans and made subject to Rome. The final breach came from Rome itself. On July 16, 1054, two Legates of the Pope laid on the altar of S. Sophia the act of excommunication which severed the Patriarch from the communion of the West, and condemned what were asserted to be seven deadly heresies of the Eastern Church." It is hardly necessary to point out all the inaccuracies of this account. The Normans did not conquer Apulia till Roger II (1105-1154); it had always been ecclesiastically subject to Rome. Cerularius's grievance was not the Filioque but Azyme bread. The final breach came from Constantinople. There were three Legates; they did not accuse the Eastern Church of any heresies.

It is because such travesties are all that people seem to have generally heard about the greatest calamity that ever befel Christendom, and especially because of the unfailing assumption that Rome must have been the aggressor, that these two chapters contain so much detail about a story that is itself neither very interesting nor at all edifying.

Summary.

The story of the final schism in the 11th century is a much worse case of Byzantine arrogance and intolerance than the story of Photius. In 1053 Michael Cerularius suddenly, for no reason whatever except apparently for some private scheme of ambition, declares war against Rome and the Latin West. He makes one of his metropolitans—Leo of Achrida—send an offensive letter to a Latin bishop; himself publishes over the East a treatise against Latins, and shuts all the Latin churches in his patriarchate. The Emperor, Constantine IX, wants peace. The Pope, St. Leo IX, sends three Legates to Constantinople; but Cerularius will have nothing to do with them, and has already struck the Pope's name off his diptychs. At last, in 1054, the Legates lay a bull of excommunication against (not the Byzantine Church but) Cerularius and his adherents on the altar of the Hagia Sophia. Cerularius orders all the other Eastern patriarchs to remove the

Pope's name from their diptychs, and grossly misrepresents what has happened. But the Patriarch of Antioch, for one, still tries to make peace. After the schism, Cerularius, by far the strongest man at Constantinople, becomes a sort of kingmaker, till at last he falls and dies, just as he has been condemned for treason. After his death he becomes a quite mythical hero.

PART III

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH SINCE THE SCHISM

ONE of the many deplorable results of the great Eastern schism was that from that time the people of Western Europe—that is the nations that were in every way the leaders of civilization—gradually lost sight of their fellow-Christians on the other side of the Adriatic. The Popes never forgot the ancient Churches now cut off from their communion. We shall see how they tried to close up the breach ; always from the 11th century to the 20th Rome has schemed, arranged, worked in every possible way for the re-conversion of the Eastern schismatics. And for a time, after the 11th century, people in the West were still conscious of that wonderful city on the Bosphorus, where in half-mythical splendour reigned the great prince whom they now barbarously called the “Greek Emperor.”

The Crusades brought Eastern and Western Europe together for a time, but really only as enemies ; already, then, these Greeks were almost as strange to our fathers as the Saracens and Turks whom they went out to fight. Then came the fall of Constantinople, and a thick cloud falls over all the Eastern Churches, till in the 19th century at last the first beginnings of Christian independence in the Balkan Peninsula drew people’s attention incidentally to the metropolitans and popes who helped the insurrections.

The period from the schism in 1054 to the beginning of Greek independence in 1821 is cut in half by the fall of Constantinople in 1453. During the first half the facts that will most interest Catholics are the attempts at reunion and the Crusades, as far as they affect the Eastern Churches ; concerning the period after 1453, one should have some idea of the conditions under which the Christians subject to the Turk lived, of their relations to the Roman See, of perhaps one or two of their theologians during this time, and especially of the great affair of Cyril Lukaris and the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672.

CHAPTER VI

THE REUNION COUNCILS

THE Popes, after the schism had become an undeniable fact, never lost hope of undoing it. Of the numberless attempts made by them, the messages, conferences, proposals, that were taken up by one Pope after another, the most important were three councils—at Bari in 1098, Lyons in 1274, and Ferrara-Florence in 1439. We may notice at once that the attitude of Rome towards the Eastern schismatics has always been rather different from that towards Protestants. First, to the canonist and theologian, who do not measure the dignity of Churches by their riches or numbers, the loss of the great Apostolic Eastern Churches is much more deplorable than that of the Protestant bodies. Secondly, there is not the special bitterness about the Eastern schism that there is about the Reformation. The first Protestants were the children of the Pope's own patriarchate, whose fathers had been converted from Rome, who had used the Roman rite, and had received the Holy Orders they now rejected from the Pope. Thirdly, the Eastern Churches are far nearer to us than any Protestant congregation. Practically, as we shall see, the only thing wrong with the Easterns is the schism. Their faith hardly differs at all from ours. And they are corporate bodies, Churches in themselves, quite properly constituted with a hierarchy whose orders no one has ever thought of questioning. And with such bodies the Roman Church can treat. So Rome has always been very much more conciliatory to the Eastern Churches than to Protestants. With the numberless Protestant sects she can have no

communication; out of a disorderly crowd of rebels¹ each member must come back and be reconciled by himself, with the Eastern Churches corporate reunion is a really possible ideal. We express it all roughly, but quite well, when we call Protestants heretics and the "Orthodox" schismatics, and when we pray for the conversion of Protestants and for the reunion of the Eastern Churches.

1. The Council of Bari, 1098.

The Western Church did not realize at once, in 1054, that a permanent rupture had now come. There were still relations in one or two cases before all intercourse came to an end. Pope Alexander II (1061-1073) sent Peter, Bishop of Anania, in 1071 to the Emperor Michael VII (1071-1078), apparently to discuss political questions only. The Emperor received Peter very kindly and entertained him for a whole year, but the Patriarch John VIII (1064-1075) and his clergy would have no communion with him. There were still some theologians in the Byzantine Church who saw no reason for schism, and who wrote to protest against the absurd fuss that was being made about harmless local Latin customs, such as Theophylactus of Achrida (successor of the Leo who had opened the campaign), who, about 1070, wrote an allocution defending the Latins, except in the matter of the Filioque.² They were the first members of the Latinizing party that has existed ever since in the Orthodox Church. But gradually all friendly relations ceased, and every one realized that a definite schism had now established two rival communions. And then, as always happens, the differences become fossilized, and the two streams, once parted, flowed farther and farther apart. At last some Latin writers, unfortunately, began making unworthy reprisals and, forgetting the dignified tradition of their side in this miserable quarrel, found fault with various quite harmless Byzantine customs in the same mean spirit as their charges against us.

¹ One regrets having to speak disrespectfully of any religion, especially of any Christian bodies. At the same time to understand this point one must realize the attitude that the Roman See inevitably takes up, that is the only possible one from her point of view.

² Will, *o.c.* pp. 229-253.

The first council held between, at any rate, some members of either side after the schism was at Bari, in Apulia, in 1098. Pope Urban II (1088-1099) was carrying on the fight of Gregory VII against the Emperor Henry IV (1056-1106), and in 1095 had proclaimed the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont. Then, possibly in connection with that movement, he held this synod at Bari. The hero of the council was our St. Anselm of Canterbury († 1109), and as its Acts have been lost the little we know about it is from Eadmer's life of his master.¹ Anselm had fled from the Red King the year before (1097) and was now in the Pope's company.

The "Greeks" at Bari were probably bishops of the Byzantine rite in Southern Italy.² The Normans were then conquering those parts, and whatever pretence of jurisdiction the Patriarch of Constantinople had advanced over "greater Greece" was now coming definitely to an end (p. 46). But these Italian Greeks shared the ideas of their fellow-countrymen across the Adriatic about the Filioque, and this council was held to convert them on that point. Although Cerularius had made so little of the Filioque grievance, it will now be (with the Primacy) always the chief difference between the two Churches. It is not known how many Greeks were present nor who they were. Nor is the result of the council known, except that under the pressure of the Norman Government all these Italo-Greeks did eventually accept both the Pope's jurisdiction and the Catholic faith about the procession of the Holy Ghost. There was never again any question of schism in greater Greece. All we know of the council is this scene described by Eadmer, who was present with St. Anselm. Pope Urban begins by explaining our faith in the double procession. Then the Greeks answer him and the Pope seems to have got into difficulties, for he cries out: "Father and master, Anselm, Archbishop of the English, where are you?" St. Anselm was sitting in the front rank of the fathers, "and I," says Eadmer, "sat at his feet." Now he stands up and answers: "Lord and father, here I am, what do you want?" "What are you doing?" says the Pope, "why do

¹ M.P.L. clviii.

² There does not seem to have been any one from the East present.

you not speak? Come, I beg you, help us to fight for your Mother and ours. Look at these Greeks who are trying to soil her purity by dragging us into their error." St. Anselm then goes up and stands by the Pope, and all the Fathers begin talking at once and asking who this stranger may be. Urban tells them to be quiet and explains to them Anselm's fame, his great holiness, and how he is now an exile for the faith. Then Anselm speaks and refutes all the difficulties of the Greeks. When he has done the Pope says: "Blessed are the words that came from your lips." Unfortunately Eadmer cannot tell us much about what St. Anselm actually said. Instead of listening to what was going on he had been staring about him. First he notices that the Archbishop of Beneventum was wearing by far the finest cope. Then he suddenly recognizes this cope as one sent to Beneventum by Egelnoth, a former Archbishop of Canterbury, in exchange for a relic. He is further surprised to see that the Pope is not wearing a cope but a chasuble with the pallium over it. However, Eadmer's distractions do not much matter, because St. Anselm afterwards wrote down all his arguments in a treatise "Of the Procession of the Holy Ghost," which is published with his other works.¹ This same Synod of Bari was about to excommunicate William Rufus of England, but St. Anselm persuaded the Pope to be patient with him yet a little longer. That is all that is known about it.

2. The Second Council of Lyons, 1274.

All through the 13th century, since the Crusaders had taken Constantinople in 1204 (p. 225), the Eastern Empire, now shut up in a corner of Asia Minor around Nicæa between the Latins and the Turks, was reduced almost to the last gasp. In their despair the Emperors saw the only hope in an alliance with the West. If the Crusaders, instead of attacking them, would join them against the Turk, there might yet be some chance for the old Empire. And they saw that the first step to such

¹ M.P.L. clviii. St. Peter Damian also wrote a book "Against the error of the Greeks touching the Procession of the Holy Ghost," M.P.L. cxlv.

an alliance must be reunion with the Latin Church. So there are a succession of embassies, proposals, arrangements made for this purpose by the Emperors, which eventually lead to reunion at the Council of Lyons in 1274. But the people over there were against the union all the time. Now especially, after the outrages they had suffered from the Crusaders, their hatred of the Franks had grown tenfold, and even to the Government the union was really only an annoyance to be borne for political reasons. So naturally the union did not last. Only in the West was there a real enthusiasm for reunion for its own sake. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanos II (1222-1240), now in exile with the Emperor at Nicæa, wrote to Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241) in 1232 acknowledging his Primacy, and asking for reunion. The Pope sent four friars, two Dominicans and two Franciscans, with letters to Nicæa. They were very well received by the Emperor (John III, 1222-1254), but they could not arrange a union. Michael Palaiologos (Michael VIII, 1259-1282), after he had reconquered Constantinople (1261), again opened negotiations with the Pope. He was still afraid of having to defend his city against another Crusade. If only the Latins would acknowledge him and help him fight the common enemy of all Christians, the Turk, he might yet save or even enlarge his Empire.

As soon as Gregory X (1271-1276) became Pope, he set about arranging for a general council. This council was once more to arouse the Western princes to a great Crusade, so as to save the remnants of the Latin princedoms in the Holy Land, now in deadly danger, and to arrange a reunion with the Eastern Churches.

The council met on May 7, 1274, in the Cathedral of Lyons; ¹ five hundred bishops and one thousand abbots were present, also King James I of Aragon, and ambassadors from the (Western) Empire, France, England, and Sicily, as well as the Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch (p. 224); the Greek bishops arrived at the third session, on June 24th. This is the Second Council of Lyons and the fourteenth

¹ The first Council of Lyons (the thirteenth general council) had met in 1245.

œcumenical council. The Latin Patriarch of Constantinople was given the second place after the Pope—the first recognition on the part of the Roman Church of the old claim of Constantinople to that place, now made in favour of a man whom the patriarch of the old line of course abhorred. The greatest theologians in the Church were summoned. St. Thomas Aquinas died on the way (March 7, 1274);¹ St. Bonaventure was the soul of all the discussions till he too died (July 15, 1274) during the council. Meanwhile, at Constantinople Michael VIII had been doing everything he could to bring about the union. A Franciscan, John Parastron, himself a born Greek, had been travelling backwards and forwards, arguing and persuading, but the Patriarch Joseph I (1268–1274) would have nothing to say to any peace with the Latins. So they shut him up in a monastery and told him that if the union succeeded he would have to stay there, but if it did not he might come back and be Patriarch again. Meanwhile John Bekkos (John XI, 1274–1282) was set up in his stead. This Bekkos had been an enemy of the Latins, but he now became or professed to be as eager for reunion as the Emperor himself. They sent to Lyons as ambassadors Germanos, an ex-Patriarch of Constantinople (he had been Germanos III, 1267),² Theophanes, Metropolitan of Nicæa, George Akropolites the Imperial Chancellor, and two other lay statesmen. These persons arrived, having been plainly told to concede anything and to make sure of the union whatever happened; so there were practically no discussions and there was no difficulty at all. In the name of their Emperor, the Patriarch, and the Orthodox Church they admitted the Roman Primacy, the Filioque, and everything. The Orthodox were to restore the Pope's name to their diptychs, to keep all their own rites, customs, and laws, and were not to add the Filioque to their Creed over there, although they were

¹ Among his numberless works he had already written a "Treatise against the Greeks" (1252).

² Especially since the schism under both Emperors and Sultans Patriarchs are incessantly being deposed, restored, and then deposed again. The line of Patriarchs of Constantinople is by far the most tangled confusion of that of any see in Christendom.

to acknowledge the doctrine. On the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul High Mass was sung according to the Latin rite, the Epistle and Gospel were sung in Latin and Greek, after the Latin Creed the same Creed was sung again in Greek by Germanos and the Italo-Greek bishops, and they had to sing "who proceeds from the Father and the Son" three times. And St. Bonaventure preached. In the last sessions the decrees of the council were drawn up and were promulgated by the Pope on November 1st.¹ The first dogmatic decree is that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father and the Son as from one principle in one "*Spiratio*."² The Byzantine delegates then went back with letters from the Pope to the Emperor, the Patriarch, and all bishops of their Church.

As soon as they arrived the Pope's name was restored to the diptychs, and a great Liturgy was celebrated at which the Epistle and Gospel were sung in Greek and Latin—a return for the compliment at Lyons. But the people did not want the union, and an insurrection against it was cruelly put down. John Bekkos then wrote and argued in favour of it, and two bishops and two Dominicans sent by the Pope as Legates were received with great honour. But gradually, as the Emperor saw that no Crusaders came to fight for him, his ardour cooled too. Pope John XXI (1276–1277) made the fatal mistake of requiring them to add the Filioque to their Creed, in spite of the agreement at Lyons. This greatly increased the anti-papal party. Michael VIII then gave up quarrelling with his own people for the sake of a policy that had failed, and the union became the merest shadow of a pretence. Pope Nicholas III (1277–1280) finally excommunicated Michael as a favourer of schism. As soon as Michael died his successor, Andronikos II (1282–1328), broke the last link. He formally repudiated the union, brought the ex-patriarch, Joseph I, out of the monastery where he had

¹ In Mansi, xxiv. 109–132. The council defined many other questions, chiefly of Canon Law. The most important is about Papal Election; the laws of the Conclave date from this council. All Church property was to be taxed for a great Crusade.

² For the theology of the Filioque see p. 372.

been shut up, restored him (although he was on his death-bed), and deposed John Bekkos. Then the Emperor did public penance for having formerly accepted the union, and made every one else do so too. The whole movement had never been a really genuine one, and it now came to an utter end. Already it was the enemies of the union who could pose as the conservative party, and the intensely conservative instinct of all Easterns in Church matters made that position a stronger one as each century passed, strengthening the schism merely by making it older.¹

3. The Council of Ferrara-Florence, 1438-1439.

The most famous reunion council was that held by Eugene IV at Ferrara and Florence. Its story is very much like that of the Second Council of Lyons. Again the Eastern Empire is in the direst distress from the Turks, again the Emperor wants union with the Latins for purely political reasons—that they may come and fight for him—and again the union is hated and soon denounced by the Byzantines. Pope Eugene IV (Gabriel Condolmer, 1431-1447) was having great trouble with the Council of Basel. At that time the schism of the West was just over, and the whole Catholic world had been scandalized by seeing two and then even three rival claimants to the Papacy. In that horrible confusion many people saw only one means of restoring order, a general council. This was the cure for all evils, and so they were always demanding general councils. There had been a great council at Pisa in 1409, another at Constance from 1414-1418, and as soon as Eugene IV was elected again every one clamoured for another general council to reform the Church. Since the confusion of the Western schism people had begun to distinguish between a council and its president the Pope, and the watchword of the reforming party was that a council is above every one, even the Pope. The Pope must obey a general council like any one else; once it has been lawfully summoned it can do anything—

¹ The story of the Second Council of Lyons will be found in any Church History. See especially Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* (ed. 2), vi. pp. 119, *seq.*

even depose the Pope. This had been defined at Constance in the third session—before it became an œcumenical synod. Wyclif and Hus had appeared, strange antinomian sects already abounded who taught the wildest extravagances and entirely rejected all ecclesiastical authority. The first breath of the great storm that was coming—the Protestant Reformation—was in the air. Eugene IV had sworn at his election to summon yet another council; so unwillingly he had to do so. He opened the synod at Basel on July 23, 1431, through his Legate, Cardinal Cesarini. Then, as very few Fathers came, he dissolved it almost at once and summoned it to Bologna. But the council would not go there, it got out of hand almost at once, demanded the retraction of the bull of dissolution, renewed the decree of Constance that a general council is above the Pope, summoned Eugene to appear before it, then declared him contumacious, deposed him, and set up Duke Amadeus of Savoy as anti-Pope—Felix V. By this time all the moderate members had left Basel; no one wanted a renewal of the time when the Church was torn by the claims of two Popes. Æneas Silvius Piccolomini (afterwards Pius II, 1458–1464) and Nicholas of Cusa, Bishop of Brixen, who were at first the leading spirits at Basel, went over to the Pope's side. The schismatical council, now reduced to about twenty or thirty bishops under Cardinal d'Allemand, Archbishop of Arles, lost the sympathy of every one by its extravagance, and at last even Duke Amadeus went quietly home, and the whole movement whittled out almost unnoticed in 1443.

Meanwhile Eugene IV had again changed the place where his council was to be held, and summoned it from Bologna to Ferrara on September 11, 1437. The bishops at Basel, who made up their number by admitting a crowd of parish priests and doctors of divinity, excommunicated every one who took any part in the proceedings at Ferrara. Eugene excommunicated all the rabble at Basel. The object of the council at Ferrara was to be reunion with the Eastern Churches. It would be, indeed, a triumph for the Pope if he could show the Christian world that just now, when he was at war with what called itself an œcumenical council, he

had once again joined all the Easterns to the West under his authority. And the Byzantine Court, at any rate, was very willing to be reunited. The Eastern Roman Empire was then at its very last gasp. The Ottoman Turks had come into Europe, taking Adrianople in 1354; then gradually they had swallowed up more and more of the Empire. Macedonia, Thessaly, Thrace, Bulgaria, Servia had all gone. Every one knew that they meant to take Constantinople, and, unless help came from the West, it could only be a question of time, and of a very short time, till they did so. So again during the early part of the 15th century there had been negotiations with the Latins. Already at Constance in 1418 an embassy from the Eastern Emperor had appeared; Pope Martin V (1417-1431) had had relations with the other patriarchs. The Emperor John VII (Palaiologos, 1425-1448) at last made up his mind that some steps must be taken at once. Unfortunately there were two powers, each claiming to represent the Latin Church, that wanted to treat with him, Pope Eugene and the Basler Fathers. Eugene was first in the field and sent a fleet of ships to Constantinople to bring the Emperor and his bishops to Ferrara; while they are waiting another fleet arrives, sent by the Council of Basel. The Pope's admiral is so angry at this that he is hardly prevented from sailing out to fight the council's fleet. So the first time the Byzantines saw these Latins who had come to preach the absolute necessity of union to them they enjoyed the edifying spectacle of a violent schism nearly leading to battle between two Latin parties. However, consistent to their own traditions, the Greeks thought that if they were to have any dealings with the Latins at all it must be with the Latin Patriarch, so they would have nothing to say to the Basler Council. The Pope agreed to pay all expenses and to entertain them as long as they were in Italy. The Emperor came himself with a gorgeous train. The dying Empire still had wonderful jewels, brocades and vestments, relics of a better time, and all these were shipped onto the Pope's vessels to impress the Latins. With the Emperor came the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II (1416-1439, his own brother and a very old man), twenty-two other bishops, and a train of seven

hundred followers ; the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem sent legates.

They land at Venice on February 8, 1438, are received by the Doge with great pomp and are enormously impressed by the splendour of the city.¹ From this time the question of reunion was enormously complicated and confused by the most absurd quarrels about precedence and etiquette. It was the first time an Emperor of the old line had come to the West for nine hundred years. Pathetically true to the theory on which his whole system was based, even now on the eve of utter disaster, John VII insists on acting as the successor of Julius Cæsar ; he is Augustus, Autocrat of the Romans, Lord of the Christian World. The people he meets in Italy are still to him and to his Court barbarians, Franks, savage tribes with whom the Roman Emperor condescends to treat. But the Western princes, who had almost forgotten the existence of the Eastern Empire, see in him only a poor Greek king who has come to beg their protection against his enemies.

The Greeks then come to Ferrara and the Emperor enters the city under a great canopy at the head of his retinue, all decked out as sumptuously as possible. But the Patriarch is told he must kiss the Pope's foot. He says he will not dream of doing any such thing ; if the Pope is older than he is he will treat him as a father, if the same age as a brother, if younger as a son. The Pope then agrees to kiss the Patriarch's cheek. So that trouble passed over. Although the motive that brought the Byzantines to Ferrara was really only a political one, there were on both sides men who hoped for reunion for its own sake and for religious reasons. The Pope doubtless was pleased at the idea of the triumph over the Basler schismatics that this union would bring him, but he was also a really good man, and he made very great sacrifices both of his dignity and his money for the sake of healing the lamentable breach that divided Christen-

¹ Sylvester Syropoulos, a bitter enemy of the Latins, who came in the Emperor's train, afterwards wrote an entertaining account of all their journey and adventures (done into Latin by Robert Creighton, who, however, writes his author's name wrong, Silv. Sguropuli : *Vera historia unionis non veræ*, Hagæ Com. 1660).

dom. It is also to his everlasting credit that he alone of the Western princes afterwards kept his word and really did send help against the Turk. In the Emperor's train were two bishops who also deserve to be remembered with honour by every one who cares for the cause of union between the Churches, Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev, and Bessarion, Metropolitan of Nicæa. Both were eager for the union, and both worked hard all the time to overcome the barriers. Bessarion was one of the greatest men of his age. Afterwards he became a great leader of the Renaissance, and he is famous as a scholar and patron of letters, while we remember him, too, as always a staunch and loyal friend to the Holy See from the Eastern Church. But among the Byzantine bishops was also Mark Eugenikos, Metropolitan of Ephesus, as determined an enemy of any compromise with the Latin heretics as Isidore and Bessarion were friends of reunion. The council had already been opened on January 8, 1438, at Ferrara, the Byzantines arrive on February 28th. It sat at Ferrara for nearly a year (sixteen sessions); then in January, 1439, the Pope proposed that it should move to Florence because the pest had broken out at Ferrara. An even weightier reason seems to have been that his finances were running out (all the time he was royally entertaining the Emperor and his seven hundred followers), and that the city of Florence had offered to lend large sums of money if the council came there. The idea that he wanted to get the Greeks further away from the sea-board and therefore more entirely in his own power (afterwards suggested by some of them¹) is quite absurd. In any case they could not get away until he lent them his ships again. The council now stayed at Florence till the Byzantines went back home in August, 1439.² There were at first endless disputes as to how the Fathers should sit, what rank each was to have, and so on. The Emperor very nearly left the council because the ambassador of the Duke of Burgundy would not do

¹ This is Syropoulos's idea.

² As its decrees were published there it is generally called the Council of Florence. Not to have to remember two dates, one may connect it with the date of that publication and impress on one's mind: The seventeenth general council (reunion with the Eastern Churches) at Florence in 1439.

him homage. The Greeks were always turning sulky and saying that they would go back home if they were not treated properly. Although it was the Easterns who had everything to gain by the union and who had really come to be saved from utter disaster, the ridiculous pride that never forsook Byzantines made them insist on the most exaggerated deference. All through the Latins showed much more zeal for the union than they did, and the Latins humoured their pride generously. It was agreed that the Latins should sit all down the Gospel side of the church with the Pope at their head, and the Byzantines down the Epistle side under the Emperor (that is what they wanted !); after the Emperor sat the Patriarch. Only in one point the Greeks could not have their way : the Patriarch's throne had to be three steps lower than the Pope's. While the long months dragged on in this strange land the Greeks got very homesick ; they understood nothing of the rites they saw around them, they complained that when they went into a Latin church they could make nothing of the ikons, there was not a single Saint they even knew by sight, the crucifixes were solid statues, all they could do was to chalk up two lines on a wall cross-wise and say their prayers before that.¹ Indeed by this time the liturgy of either side had become a deep and suspicious mystery to the other. Towards the end of the council the Pope was to assist in state at the Byzantine Liturgy. Then he said that he was not sure what they did and that he would like to see it all done in private first before he committed himself to a public assistance. Naturally they were very indignant. On this occasion the Emperor let fall the astonishing remark that they had come all this way to reform the Latin Church. The Greeks could not bear our plainsong, but they had the comfort of being able to wear far more gorgeous vestments. The old Patriarch Joseph never went back to his own country. He died while the council was going on (June 10, 1439), having first written down his acceptance of the union and his acknowledgement of the Roman Primacy. So he was buried with great honour at Florence in St. Maria Novella. There he still lies, far

¹ Syropoulos, 109, quoted in Creighton's *Hist. of the Papacy*, Longmans, 1899, vol. ii. p. 335.

away from his city, among the Latins whose ways he could not understand, and a set of Latin verses over his tomb still tells the traveller of the strange chance that brought "Joseph, the great prelate of the Eastern Church," to be buried here. Meanwhile, the real business of the council was this. First ten Fathers from either side were elected to examine the differences between the Churches. On the Byzantine side the chief members of this commission were Isidore of Kiev and Bessarion, both conciliatory, and Mark of Ephesus, steadily opposed to us. The chief Latins were Cardinal Julian Cesarini, Andrew Archbishop of Rhodes, and John of Montenegro, who on one occasion made a speech that lasted two whole days. The differences were: the Filioque, Azyne bread at Mass, Purgatory, the Epiklesis, the Primacy. They soon agreed about Purgatory when they were told that material fire is not part of the faith of the Latin Church. They gave in altogether about the Epiklesis¹ and admitted that Consecration takes place at the words of Institution. As for Azymes, the Turkish armies at their very gates had at last made them see reason; they admitted that both leavened and unleavened bread are equally valid and lawful. Naturally the longest discussions were about the Filioque and the Primacy.

In the Filioque dispute Mark of Ephesus got into trouble for misquoting St. Basil. At last the Greeks agreed to admit the formula of their own Fathers, and both sides united in the confession that the Holy Ghost proceeds from one principle and that the truth is rightly expressed by the Latins who say "from the Father and the Son" as well as by the Greeks in their form "from the Father through (*διὰ*) the Son."² The Easterns were not asked to add anything to their Creed—a position, by the way, that the tolerance of the Holy See has always accepted. Concerning the Primacy they admitted this formula: "The Pope is the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, to guide and rule the whole Church of God, though without prejudice to the rights and privileges of the other Patriarchs."

¹ For this question see p. 386.

² This formula is taken from St. John Damascene, see p. 379.

So on July 6, 1439, the decree of the council was published, beginning "Let the heavens rejoice and the earth be glad," containing the articles as agreed to by both sides and solemnly proclaiming the restored union.¹ It was signed by Pope Eugene IV, eight cardinals, four Latin patriarchs, sixty-one archbishops and bishops, forty abbots and four generals of religious orders on the Latin side, and by the Emperor John VIII, the Vicegerent of Constantinople (the see being vacant), the legates of the three other patriarchs, sixteen metropolitans, four deacons, and various laymen. Only Mark of Ephesus would not sign. On August 26th the Byzantines went back home on the Pope's ships. After they had gone the council went on sitting, chiefly to complete its work by reuniting the other Eastern Churches. The Armenians had already long opened negotiations with the Roman Church. John XXII (1316-1334) had founded a mission of Dominicans in Armenia and had already brought about a union. Now the Armenian Katholikos sent four legates to Florence to renew and strengthen this union. They did not arrive till the Byzantines had gone. In November the decree of this union was published. The Armenians renounced Monophysism, accepted the Council of Chalcedon and the Filioque. At the same time Eugene IV published his Instruction for the Armenians about the Sacraments, which has become famous because of its teaching concerning Holy Orders.² The Copts and Abyssinians also sent a legate, the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria sent a certain John, who was Abbot of the monastery of St. Anthony. This Abbot John was also authorized by the King of Abyssinia to act as his ambassador. There was then a rivalry and schism going on among the Syrian Jacobites, who had set up two rival patriarchates since 1293. The Eastern

¹ One word in this decree has been very much discussed. The Latin text defines the Primacy and adds: "as is also contained (quemadmodum etiam continetur) in the Acts of the general councils," &c. So does the original Greek text signed by the Emperor and others and still kept at Florence (καθ' ὃν τρόπον διαλαμβάνεται). Some Gallican theologians (Febronius) afterwards said that this was a later alteration and that the original text had: "according to the manner contained (quem ad modum et continetur)." See Hergenröther: *Anti-Janus* (Freiburg, 1870), pp. 118, seq.

² Denzinger, No. 590.

rival, who ruled over all the Jacobites living between the Tigris and the Euphrates, and the Metropolitan of Edessa sent legates to Rome, for in 1444 Eugene had once more moved the council, that still went on sitting, to Rome. All the Maronites who had not already been converted at the time of the Crusades now came in too, but only one Nestorian bishop (Timothy of Tarsus) with a few people. Of course all these heretics gave up their errors, accepted the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon and acknowledged the Roman Primacy.¹ We count the Council of Florence as the seventeenth œcumenical synod. It is difficult to see from what point of view its œcumenical character could be denied. It was held in the presence of the Pope, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the legates of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. There were many more Easterns present than there had been Latins at any of the early synods that we all agree in calling œcumenical. Even if one were to take up the shamelessly Erastian position that the Emperor's presence and consent are necessary, Florence had both. Indeed, as a last possibility, if one were to require the presence of such old schismatical bodies as the Monophysites and Nestorians (a position which the Orthodox would of course abhor, and which would involve the denial of all councils except the first two), the heads of the Armenian, Coptic, and Abyssinian Churches were represented, and there were at least some Jacobites and Nestorians present. So that except, perhaps, Nicæa in 325 no council has ever had such a clear right to be considered œcumenical. This is, perhaps, the reason why the Orthodox who now reject its decrees quite specially hate it.² But the union of Florence was destined to come to as bad an end as that of Lyons two centuries before. On the Byzantine side it had been from the beginning a political move of the Government which the people had never wanted. As soon as the Emperor and his followers came home again to Constanti-

¹ Most of these Churches fell away again in part afterwards. But since the Council of Florence there has always been a body of Uniates from each, and all the Maronites are still Catholics.

² For the history of the Council of Florence see the Acts in Mansi, xxi.; the decree in Denzinger, lxxiii. Also Hefele, vii. pp. 681, *seq.*

nople they found every one in an uproar against them. They had betrayed the Orthodox faith, they had all become Azymites, Creed-tamperers, cheese-eaters, dogs, heretics, hypocrites and Latins. Mark of Ephesus was the hero of the hour. But the Emperor kept to what he had done. The successor of old Joseph II (who had died at Florence) was Metrophanes II (1440-1443), also a friend of the union, and when he gave his blessing in public the people turned away their faces not to be defiled by a Latinizer's prayer. But the Pope's name was restored to the diptychs, and officially the Byzantine Church was in communion with Rome. John VIII died in that communion, and his brother, the last Emperor Constantine XII (1448-1453), was also determined to uphold it. On the very eve of the fall of the city—on December 12, 1452—he held a great feast of the union; and when the hero-Emperor fell before the walls of his city he, too, died a Catholic. But the help from the Franks did not come. Eugene IV did everything he could to send it; he unceasingly wrote to the Western princes, imploring them to prevent the awful calamity that was at hand; but they would not listen. At least the Pope did what he himself could; he sent two galleys and three hundred soldiers, but of course so small a number could not make much difference.

It was not till after the fall of Constantinople that the union was formally repudiated by the Byzantine Church. Mohammed the Conqueror naturally did not want the Christians over whom he ruled to be friends with the great Western Powers, so the cause of "Orthodoxy" found a new champion in the Turkish conqueror, of all people.¹ As soon as he had taken the city he sent for the leader of the schismatical party, George Scholarios (who seems to have been a layman), and had him made Patriarch (p. 241). Scholarios became Gennadios II (1453-1456). But it was not till 1472 that a synod at Constantinople solemnly rejected the union and anathematized the Council of Florence and all who accepted its decrees. During the thirty-three years then, between 1439 and 1472, the Byzantine Church was, at any rate officially, in communion with the Holy See. But the people of the city, now as wildly fanatical and intolerant

¹ One Turk—Murad—even wrote a polemical treatise against the union!

as the last remnant of a lost cause always is (witness the Jews of Jerusalem during the siege), had said : Rather the Sultan's turban than the Pope's tiara ; and they have had their wish.

4. Cardinal Bessarion.

The two metropolitans who had most favoured the union ended by coming over to live in the West. Eugene IV made both cardinals. Isidore of Kiev when he got back to Russia was promptly put in gaol for his share in the union. He escaped in 1443, came to Rome, and, as Cardinal Isidore, was Legate to Constantinople and leader of the little band of soldiers whom the Pope sent to help the Emperor. He was called the *Cardinalis Ruthenus*. The *Cardinalis Nicenus* was Bessarion. He at last despaired of his own people, and came to settle at Rome.¹ Here he became one of the leaders of the Renaissance movement. A scholar equally versed in Greek and Latin, he was one of the first men who introduced to the Western world the forgotten Greek classics. He was an enthusiastic Platonist, and by his writings greatly helped on the study of Plato, that, with the reaction against Aristotle (who had reigned unquestioned "master of them that know" in the middle ages), was one of the chief notes of the Renaissance. He was always a generous and splendid patron to the poor Greek scholars who had fled from Constantinople ; a lavish collector of Greek manuscripts² that he then edited or translated. He held in his palace an Academy of Italian and Greek Humanists, and although he had left his own country he never forgot his patriotism, and lavishly helped every enterprise against its enemies. The Popes continually used him as Legate,³ and charged him with the reform of the Greek

¹ He was made Bishop of Tusculum, and adopted the Latin rite. He is still always called *il cardinale greco*,⁴ or *niceno*.

² He had a library of 746 MSS., mostly Greek, that had cost him 15,000 ducates : by the advice of Pope Paul II he left it to the Venetian Republic, the connecting link between East and West. It was the nucleus of the Library of St. Mark.

³ He was Legate at Bologna from 1450 to 1455, where he put an end to all discord, and magnificently restored and endowed the university.

monasteries in Southern Italy. He was a warm friend to Grottaferrata, the chief of these monasteries.¹ As a scholar, philosopher, and Mæcenas, he redeemed the honour of the Greek name throughout Europe; certainly no one in his age was more worthy of the sacred purple. After having very nearly become Pope² he died in 1472. It was doubtless not only the religious motive³ that led the great Humanist to despair of the wild fanaticism, hopeless narrowness and unbearable pride of his own countrymen, and to turn away from the ugly clouds that gathered around the dying Empire to take his part in the movement that was rising like a wonderful dawn all over the broad lands of the West. And we, who know what we owe to the light of the Renaissance and who are grateful to the men who brought it, have to remember together with the Humanist Popes, with More, Erasmus and the others, also the Nicene Cardinal, Bessarion.

Summary.

Since the schism there have been three councils in which Eastern and Western bishops met to discuss their differences. At Bari, in 1098, Pope Urban II summoned some Greeks, apparently Calabrians or Sicilians, and argued with them about the Filioque. St. Anselm of Canterbury defended the Catholic belief; otherwise this synod is not at all important and we know little about it. Two general councils brought about a reunion, each for a short time. The Eastern Emperor, Michael VIII, sent ambassadors to the Second Council of Lyons, held in 1274 by Pope Gregory X. They accepted the faith of the Roman Church in every point at once, in

¹ Bessarion was made titular Abbot of Grottaferrata. They still have his chalice there. Krumbacher: *Byz. Litt.* pp. 117-118.

² When Paul II died in 1471 the Conclave hesitated between Bessarion and Francis della Rovere, who was eventually elected, and became Sixtus IV (1471-1484).

³ It would be quite unjust to think, on the other hand, that his motive was only mean time-serving. He had eagerly defended the union, and had taken up an entirely Catholic attitude at the very beginning of the council, when no one could foresee what would be the end of things; and he never wavered from that position.

the hope of getting help from the Western princes against the Turk. But when they got back home and found that no help came the union was soon rejected by the Byzantine Church. The story of the Council of Florence in 1439 is an almost exact repetition of the same thing. Sore beset by the Turks, despairing of help save from the Franks, the last Emperor but one, John VII, came to the council with a great following, to make peace with Pope Eugene IV. Again the Eastern bishops (except one, Mark of Ephesus) agree with the Latins, and the reunion is proclaimed. But it was very unpopular at Constantinople; it lingered on, at any rate in form, for one generation, and was finally repudiated after the fall of the city by a Synod of Constantinople in 1472. Other Eastern Churches, either wholly or in part, the Armenians, Copts, Abyssinians, Maronites, some Jacobites, one Nestorian bishop, were also reunited to the Catholic Church at Florence. The Uniate Churches date from this council. Cardinal Bessarion, who had been the chief promoter of the union among the Easterns, eventually came to live at Rome, and was one of the greatest of the Renaissance scholars.

CHAPTER VII

THE CRUSADES AND THE BYZANTINE CHURCH

THE story of the Florentine Synod has brought us to the eve of the fall of Constantinople. Before we come to the effects of that calamity, we must go back for a moment to say something about the relations between Latins and Byzantines at the time of the Crusades.

I. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

The melancholy story of the Crusades themselves does not concern our subject. There are few so great disillusionments in history. The idea of a Crusade was everything that is chivalrous and unselfish. It was a triumph of the ages of faith that all Christian Europe could be moved to so great an effort for a purely religious motive. And the men who thought of saving the sacred land that our Lord had trod, and who preached the Crusades, Peter the Hermit, Pope Urban II, St. Bernard, were beautiful and ideal people, too. The first impulse was superb. One cannot remember that wave of enthusiasm, the *Dieu le veult* that rang through all the chivalry of Europe, the Truce of God, and the cross that they wore to show that they were going to fight for their Lord's fatherland, without still feeling something of the enthusiasm that Urban's voice called up in the church at Clermont. And then the Crusades were such superb pageants—the beautiful mediæval ships, with their gorgeous sails, ploughing through the Mediterranean, the men leaping out to kneel and kiss the sacred soil of Palestine, their

armour shining in the Eastern sun, the old Latin hymn sung above the clang of steel under their great banners when they first see the Holy City, golden and mystic under the deep Syrian sky. One pictures, above the lines of steel, the English leopards, the lilies of France, the great sable eagle of the Empire, and then the other coats of the great houses of Europe—chevrons and fesses and pales—till they plant above the Holy Sepulchre the banner with the five potent crosses, argent and or, unearthly, wonderful, as should be the arms of the heavenly city. And, at any rate, some of the Crusaders were very valiant knights and courteous gentlemen. St. Lewis IX of France (1226–1270) is the one example of a king who was entirely perfect, and Godfrey of Bouillon, our Richard Lion-heart, old Frederick Redbeard the Emperor, were at least eminently picturesque and imposing persons. But then, all through the Crusades, there is the other side, horrible cruelty,—as soon as they took Jerusalem (July 15, 1099) they massacred all the Jews and Moslems in the city—and then they quarrelled hopelessly among themselves. Each Crusade was less ideal than the last, till the whole movement whittled out into hordes of the riff-raff of the West pouring across Eastern Europe, plundering, burning, slaying, the pretence of fighting for the Holy Sepulchre now the merest farce.¹

And the Crusades had no lasting effect. To save themselves

¹ This is what one should remember about the Crusades: *1st Crusade*, 1095–1099. 1095, Council of Clermont (Peter the Hermit, Urban II). Godfrey of Bouillon, Adhemar of Puy Legate. 1099, Jerusalem taken. Kingdom of Jerusalem, Duchy of Antioch, County of Edessa. *2nd Crusade*, 1147, preached by St. Bernard. Conrad III, Emperor, Lewis VII of France. Utter failure. *3rd Crusade*, 1189 (Pope Clement III). Salaheddin had reconquered Jerusalem, Frederick I, Redbeard Emperor, Philip II, Augustus of France, Richard Lion-heart of England. They conquer a strip of coast, not Jerusalem. Frederick I † 1190. *4th Crusade*, 1202 (Innocent III). Baldwin of Flanders and Boniface of Monteferrata. Sack of Constantinople, 1204. Latin Empire, 1204–1261. *Crusade of the Children*, 1212. Thirty thousand children shipped off to conquer by miracle. All are made slaves by the Moslem pirates. *5th Crusade*, 1228. Frederic II, Emperor, reconquers Jerusalem for about twenty years. *6th Crusade*, 1248. St. Lewis IX of France taken prisoner at Damietta, in Egypt, and ransomed for a huge sum. *7th Crusade*, 1270. St. Lewis IX to Tunis. He dies of the pest on the Assumption. 1291, Acre, the last Christian possession, lost.

from having to concede that all that enthusiasm and all the blood shed came to nothing, people urge that they at any rate brought Christendom and the Mohammedan civilization together (so they did, across blood-dripping lances), and that they staved off the Turkish invasion of Europe for a time. At any rate, the cause the Crusaders fought for, their little Frank States planted out there between the desert and the deep sea, all came to nothing.

And they certainly did no good to the Eastern Christians. A result of the schism was that the Catholic Crusaders, when they had driven out the Turk from the Holy Land, never thought that the residuary right to this country then fell back on its former sovereign, the Roman Emperor. The Emperor was a schismatical "Greek," not much better than the Moslem they had been fighting. So they set up their Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem,¹ with the Duchy of Antioch and the County of Edessa, and (after the third Crusade) a Latin Kingdom of Cyprus, all made exactly on the model of their own States at home, with barons and a court, according to the feudal system. French was the official language, and they gave arms to all these cities, and astonishing titles to their own leaders—"Count of Jaffa," "Baron of Hebron," "Prince of Galilee," and so on. The ruins of the Romanesque churches² they built still stand above the sands of the desert as witnesses of this strange little Western world planted in the midst of another civilization.

¹ It was an elective monarchy. After Godfrey († 1100) they chose Count Baldwin of Flanders (Baldwin I, 1100-1118). There were thirteen kings of Jerusalem altogether; the last was John of Brienne (1210-1237). There is an interesting little book on this kingdom, C. R. Conder: *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*. His conclusion is: "The kingdom of Jerusalem was the model of just and moderate rule" (p. 428). The kings of Jerusalem quartered the kingdom with their paternal coat, as German bishops their sees. The *Wapenboek* of Gelderland (c. 1350), in the Brussels Library (published by V. Bouton, Paris, 1881-1897), contains the arms of Guy of Lusignan (King of Jerusalem, 1186-1192, then King of Cyprus, 1192-1194). They are: 1 and 4 argent, a cross potent between four crosslets or, for Jerusalem; 2 and 3 barry of ten azure and argent, a lion rampant gules, crowned or, for Lusignan. Although these are obviously his arms as King of Jerusalem, they are labelled "Die Coninc van Cipers."

² They practically rebuilt the Anastasis (1103-1130), which accounts for its Western Romanesque appearance.

In ecclesiastical matters they did the same. They had no idea of considering the Eastern Christians or the old lines of the Eastern bishops. If they did not actually persecute or massacre the schismatics, they left them as an inferior caste, a conquered population with endless disabilities, whom they never ceased trying to convert. On the whole, the Orthodox were distinctly worse off under the Crusaders than under the Moslem—the Crusaders promptly took their churches, for instance. The Frank knights, of course, never thought of anything but the Latin Mass and a Latin hierarchy, with mitres and chasubles and copes, just as at home. So they set up Latin Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, and under them archbishops and bishops, who sang the Roman Mass in the Anastasis and in all the churches of the Holy Land.

Two results of the Crusades still last. After they had lost Jerusalem, when Richard Lion-heart treated with Selaheddin to secure rights for Christians at the holy places, he, of course, only thought of his own *Latins*. And Selaheddin granted privileges to Christians as Richard wanted—that is, to *Latins*. Those privileges still exist, and that is why the Turkish Government formally recognizes certain rights that the *Latins* still enjoy at the Anastasis and at all the holy places. Another faint memory of the Crusaders' kingdom remains in the ecclesiastical titles they set up. There are still in Rome Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch of the Latin rite,¹ who are now only dignitaries of the Papal Court. These prelates do not in any sort of way represent the old line of Eastern bishops of those cities: they are the successors of the Latin patriarchs set up by the Crusaders. So also the titles of Eastern sees given to our auxiliary bishops, as far as they represent continuity from any line at all, are those of the sees established in the same way.²

¹ The Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem was sent back to that city in 1847 to be the head of all *Latins* in the Holy Land.

² The Latin archbishoprics of the Crusades were: Adrianople, Corinth, Athens, Candia, Rhodes, Nicosia, Tarsus, Hierapolis, Apamea, Tyre, Nazareth, Cæsarea Pal., Petra; the bishoprics, Tripolis, Biblos, Beirut, Sidon, Acre, Sebaste, Lydda, Bethlehem.

2. The Crusaders and the Empire.

The commoner way for the Crusaders to reach the Holy Land was down the valley of the Danube to Constantinople, and then by sea or across Asia Minor.¹ It was in this way that they met most Eastern Christians. Unfortunately, it was always the meeting of enemies. The Franks were astounded by the magnificence of Constantinople, but they thought the Greeks a very poor set: they were cowards, frightful liars, and stubborn schismatics. And the Byzantines thought equally ill of the Crusaders. All their old scorn for Western barbarians was now quickened by theological hatred against Latin heretics. The Franks came pushing in, noisy, quarrelsome, rude, and quite shameless Azymites; the Byzantines were frightened to death of them; they flattered them, sold them sham relics² (these barbarians were incredibly gullible), but their chief anxiety was to move them on, get rid of them across the Hellespont, where they could meet the infidel they wanted to fight. And whether they slew or were slain did not matter one jot. So Greek treachery, lying promises, and betrayal into the hands of the Turk fill up a large part of the story of the Crusades. And the Frankish knights, who, with all their roughness, were gentlemen, and had the (Western) mediæval sense of honour, stored up bitter memories against the liars who cajoled and deceived them. On the other hand the Byzantine Court was naturally furious at the ignoring of its rights shown in the establishment of the Latin States in Palestine.

3. The Fourth Crusade, 1204.

The mutual rancour between Franks and "Romans" came to a climax in the abominable story of the fourth Crusade. It was preached and energetically pushed forward by Pope Inno-

¹ The first and second Crusades went this way, so also the Germans in the third. The English and French in the third and St. Lewis went by sea all the way. The fourth went by sea to Constantinople.

² The false relics sold by the Greeks to the Crusaders are a continual complaint.

cent III (1198-1216). It was to start for Palestine from Venice in 1202 under Count Baldwin of Flanders and Marquess Boniface of Monteferrato (near Genoa). The treachery was begun by the most Serene Republic. The old blind Doge, Henry Dandolo, hated the Eastern Empire, which was the rival of Venice throughout the Mediterranean, and did not at all mind the Moslem. So he had already made a secret treaty with the Turk not to let these Crusaders come and trouble them. He then skilfully managed to use the whole Crusade for his own private and nefarious purposes. First he pointed out that they had a fine army there, and nothing to do on the way to Palestine; if he supplied ships and money and generally made them comfortable, would they take the town of Zara in Dalmatia, now rebelling, and restore it to the most Serene Republic? Then, having begun their career by doing so, they see how much easier it is to fight Christians than Turks, and they ask themselves why they should go all that way to the melancholy plains of Syria when the most sumptuous city in the world lies naked and open to be plundered. So they sail to Constantinople, first restore the Emperor Isaac II (1185-1195; 1203-1204), who had been deposed and blinded, and make his son, Alexios IV (1203-1204), Emperor with him. Then they quarrel with these persons and sack the city (April 12, 1204). Isaac, who was very old, died of fear, and they murdered Alexios. This sack of Constantinople is one of the most horrible events of Byzantine history. The Crusaders massacre right and left, doing also untold destruction to the whole city.¹ It is to the eternal honour of Pope Innocent III that as soon as he heard what they were doing, how they were using forces and money raised for a holy war to murder fellow-Christians, he sent after them to say that he had excommunicated them all. However, in spite of that they then set up a Latin Empire that lasted fifty-seven years (1204-1261). They made Baldwin the first Emperor, took away the Hagia Sophia and all the churches from the Byzantines, and set up a Venetian, Thomas Morosini,

¹ They burned down a quarter of it. The massacre went on for days. What they did not destroy they stole: the four great bronze horses outside St. Mark's were brought from Constantinople on this occasion.

as Latin Patriarch.¹ These Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople at once began quarrelling with the Pope, just as the old Byzantine ones had. Meanwhile the legitimate line of Emperors went on, having fled to Nicæa, and a third rival Empire was set up at Trebizond (Trapezus on the Black Sea).² So that at this time there were Emperors at Constantinople, Nicæa, and Trebizond. The Orthodox Patriarch accompanied his Emperor to Nicæa. The Latin Empire covered Greece (where a Prince of Achaia ruled under the Emperor), Thessaly (which had a king), and some land on either side of the Propontis. There was an independent Despot of Epirus, and Venice got Crete.³ Behind the Empire at Nicæa were the Turks under a ruler who called himself Sultan of Rum, as he sat in a land conquered from the Roman Empire. Shut up in a corner was the little Empire at Trebizond, and south of the Sultanate of Rum came what was left of the Crusaders' kingdom of Jerusalem. At last, in 1261, Michael VIII (Palaiologos), of whom we have heard in connection with the Second Council of Lyons (p. 206), succeeded in reconquering Constantinople and driving out the Latins. Baldwin II (1228-1261), the fifth and last Frank Emperor, fled with the Latin Patriarch, Pantaleon. Michael VIII came back to the city in triumph, restored everything as it had been before 1204, and the incident of the fourth Crusade was at an end. Except that the Greek people have never forgotten it, and that of all the things they complain of against the Latins, none has left such a legacy of hatred as this.

¹ Old Dandolo had come with them and died at Constantinople. A plain slab in the floor of the Hagia Sophia still bears the inscription *Henricus Dandolo*.

² The Emperor had made Alexios Komnenos Duke of Trebizond just before the fourth Crusade. About 1240, the fourth Duke, John Komnenos, seeing Emperors at both Constantinople and Nicæa, thought he might as well be one too, especially as he had Imperial blood (his forbears, the Komnenoi, had held the Roman throne from 1081 to 1185). So he called himself Emperor of the East, Iberia and Peratea, avoiding the name Roman so as not to offend the Palaiologos at Nicæa too utterly. This Empire at Trebizond lasted till 1461 (p. 232, n. 2).

³ The Doge of Venice now added to his titles that of "Despot of a quarter and an eighth of the whole Roman Empire." The Republic did not, of course, possess anything like a quarter or an eighth of the Empire. It is only the pleasant mediæval taste for fine titles.

And, indeed, the thing was unpardonable. That an army, gathered together to defend the Christians against the Moham-medans, should, instead of doing so, destroy the very State that for five centuries had been the one bulwark of Christendom, is an unheard-of outrage. And when one remembers, too, the horrible cruelty and destruction of the sack of Constantinople, one is not surprised that even after many centuries the Greeks have not yet forgotten the day when a horde of Latin robbers so wantonly attacked their State, plundered their city, and massacred thousands of their forefathers.¹ And since they always make the mistake of counting everything done by Latins as the Pope's work, one can understand why, two hundred years later, they said they would prefer the Sultan's turban to the Pope's tiara.

Summary.

As far as the relations between the Eastern and Western Churches go, the Crusades did nothing but harm. The Byzantines were angry that the Crusaders set up Frankish States in Palestine, entirely ignoring the rights of the Empire. The Franks did not treat the Orthodox well in their little principalities and they were a turbulent, unmanageable crowd when they passed through Constantinople. On the other hand they had a long score of Greek treachery, lying, and cheating to remember. But the friction between these two sides came to a climax when, in 1204, the fourth Crusade, seduced by Venice, instead of fighting against the Turk, sacked Constantinople with every possible cruelty. So little was Pope Innocent III, who had preached the Crusade, responsible for this outrage, that he excommunicated the Crusaders for it. The Latin Empire set up then in Constantinople lasted fifty-seven years, till the Byzantines came back and destroyed it. The only survivals of the Crusades are certain Latin rights at the holy places, still acknowledged by the Turkish Government, and our titular Latin Patriarchates.

¹ In the reading-book prescribed for the primary schools of the kingdom of Greece (*νιοελληνικά ἀναγνώσματα*, Athens, 1889, vol. 2, p. 127), sliced between a gushing poem about the month of May and a description of the cholera in Athens in 1854, is a most lurid account of the horrors done in 1204 by the Franks out of hatred for the Orthodox faith.

CHAPTER VIII

UNDER THE TURK

1. The Fall of Constantinople, May 29, 1453.

IN Chapter VI we left the Eastern Roman Empire, after the Council of Florence, on the eve of destruction. The story of that calamity, the great turning-point of the history of the Orthodox Church, and one of the chief turning-points of European history, is too well known to need a long description here. The Emperor John VIII was succeeded by his brother Constantine XII (Palaiologos, 1448-1453). This most heroic prince, although now without any hope of success, was faithful to his trust to the last. The Turkish Sultan, Mohammed II (the Conqueror, 1451-1481) had now seized everything up to the very walls of Constantinople. Constantine tried desperately to get help from the West, and Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455) too did all he could to persuade his Latins to save the city. To their eternal shame no one of them would move. They did not believe that the city would really fall; it had so often come out of the direst straits before; and they really cared very little for the last poor remnant of the old Empire. The days of the Crusades had gone long ago. They reaped their desert afterwards when the Turk poured across Servia, Bosnia, Hungary, and came thundering to the very gates of Vienna.¹

But there were two honourable exceptions to this selfish policy. We have seen that Pope Eugene IV had sent all the help he could, two ships and three hundred men (p. 217).

¹ Battle of Mohács (conquest of Hungary), 1526; siege of Vienna, 1683.

The little Republic of Genoa had constant relations with Constantinople in her trade and, unlike Venice, her policy was always a friendly one to the Empire. Just across the Golden Horn, at Galata, was a colony of Genoese merchants,¹ so for their sakes too the Republic had an interest in the defence of Constantinople. Genoa then alone, besides the Holy See, sent help—a fleet of five ships and seven hundred men, under the valiant sea-captain John Giustiniani. This little fleet arrives at the gate of the Golden Horn on April 21, 1453, and finds it blockaded by 150 Ottoman galleys. With his five ships Giustiniani fights his way through them and sails into Constantinople, bringing a force that was not strong enough to save the city, but that, at any rate, could share the glory of the heroic defence, and leave to the “proud” Republic a memory of which it really had a right to be proud. Constantine XII had also tried everything to make terms with the enemy. Knowing that resistance was now quite hopeless, he sent to Mohammed to offer him any sum of money, if only he would be content with what he had already conquered and would spare the city. But Mohammed would not hear of this. To the Moslems the most glorious day of their history was approaching; ever since the time of the original Mohammed, the Prophet of God, the dream of every True Believer had been that some day they would conquer “Rum,” that is New Rome, and set up the throne of the Khalifah on the ruins of the Christian Empire. But Mohammed II was quite ready to be kind to the Emperor, to give him a palace and a pension if he would give up the city quietly. But Constantine could not do that. As long as he lived the Roman Emperor must defend the Roman world, even if that world were shut up within the walls of one city. So he answers Mohammed in words that at the end of this long Byzantine period at last are really worthy of the Roman Cæsar: “Since neither oaths, nor treaties, nor any offer can bring us peace,” he says, “go on then with the war. I trust in God; if he will soften your heart, I shall indeed rejoice, if he lets you take my

¹ These merchants at Galata formed the original nucleus of the “Latin nation,” afterwards and still officially recognized by the Porte.

city, I shall submit to his will. But until the Judge of all men settles this quarrel I must live and die defending my people." And now after a thousand years of defence against so many different enemies, New Rome is about to fall in a blaze of heroic glory that makes one forget all the ugly pages of her long history. The Romans had drawn a chain across the Golden Horn to prevent the barbarian fleet from attacking their walls. Early in May, they awoke one morning to find that fleet riding at anchor right up by the city. Mohammed had carried out the almost impossible plan of laying down greased planks round by land and of dragging his ships one by one over them. He had made the most elaborate arrangements to win at last what would be the crowning victory of his faith. A Magyar renegade made him a monstrous bronze cannon that could throw gigantic stones against the walls of the city. Seven hundred men were told off to serve this engine. Happily, when it was fired it blew up (after they had spent two hours loading it), made an appalling noise, scattered death around the Turkish camp, and judiciously selected the apostate who had made it for its first victim. The siege lasted from April 6 to May 29; 258,000 Turks fought against less than five thousand Romans.¹ After they had broken down part of the wall, Mohammed ordered a general assault for Tuesday, May 29th. He had again offered Constantine liberty, riches, and the whole Peloponnesus for a principedom; and Constantine had again refused. The Emperor had done everything that could be done, with the courage of despair. He had throughout the siege never ceased encouraging his soldiers, inspecting the defence of the walls, taking his share in every part of the work. When the morning of that most disastrous of days dawned he went to the Hagia Sophia, heard the Liturgy and received Holy Communion. It was the last Christian service held in the great cathedral, and we shall remember, too, that he received that last Sacrament in communion with the Holy See and with the Catholic Church. Then he made that speech to

¹ The whole population of Constantinople was then about 100,000. From these the Emperor's most careful muster could raise only 4,973 fighting men. Great numbers of old men, women, and children had taken refuge in the city as the Turks seized the country round.

his men that Gibbon calls the funeral oration of the Roman Empire, and rode out to die. He stood, surrounded by his guard, near the Gate of St. Romanos, defending while he lived the city he could no longer save. Fighting valiantly with his back to the wall, he fell in the tumult of the assault, as the last heir of the Roman name should fall, fighting for Christ and Rome and adorning the Imperial purple with the glory of his heroic blood.¹ Constantine Cæsar Augustus Palaiologos was the 80th Roman Emperor since Constantine the Great, the 112th since Cæsar Octavian. With him the old Empire died.

The barbarians burst into the city, carrying death and havoc, and the day that had begun with the chant of that last sad liturgy ended with the shrieks of a hideous massacre. Then Mohammed the Conqueror rode his white horse up the Hippodrome, and gradually the news spread throughout the distant lands of the Franks that at last the impossible had happened, that Constantinople had fallen; *facta est quasi vidua domina gentium*.²

¹ His body was afterwards found and recognized by the golden eagles on his shoes. Mohammed let him be buried near the Mosque of Suleiman, and a lamp is always kept burning near his tomb. As far as they dare, the Greeks still make the grave of the last Autocrat of the Romans a place of pilgrimage. But they have not canonized him; is it because he was a Catholic? However, he does not need the doubtful honour of Byzantine canonization. Saint and hero he rests in peace in the city he guarded till death, and all over the Christian world his glorious memory is honoured. In pace Christi quiescas Auguste Cæsar.

² For the fall of Constantinople see Gibbon, chap. 68, with Bury's notes. There is a good account also in De la Jonquière: *Hist. de l'Empire ottoman*, chap. 8, pp. 156-162. The rival Empire at Trebizond just outlived the one at Constantinople, and lasted till 1461. At that time David Komnenos was reigning, and when the Moslem armies surrounded his city, he, now utterly cut off from the rest of Christendom, promised to surrender it, if he and his family were given a safe passage to Europe. The Turk swore to do so, and David believed him. As soon as the Moslems entered the city they seized the Emperor and his seven sons and offered them the choice of Islam or death. The end of the last Komnenos was as glorious as that of the last Palaiologos. The youngest son did indeed apostatize, but David and the other six chose rather to die than to renounce their faith. So they were murdered. The Empress Helen then, valiantly defying the tyrant's command, herself dug a grave and buried her husband and sons. So the end of this rather absurd little Empire was dignified and glorious, and the memory of the martyrs' blood has brought it far more honour than it could have gained had it lasted.

2. The Rayahs.

It is important to understand the position of the Orthodox Christians under their Turkish masters since they have been a conquered people. It is really only one special case of the treatment of any non-Mohammedan Theists under Moslem law. The fundamental idea of that law is, first of all, that Moslems should by right rule over the whole world. The Koran says : "The earth is God's and he gives it to whom he will of his servants" (S. vii. 125) ; and this is understood to mean that God is the supreme Lord of all men, and that he gives his servants, the True Believers, Moslems, right over all. They have never distinguished religion and politics. It is a distinction they still cannot understand. All law and right comes from God and his Prophet ; and it makes no difference whether that law concern the hours of prayer or the payment of taxes. The Koran is both Bible and Code of Civil Law. The visible head of the Moslem world is the Khalifah, the Vicar of Mohammed ; all authority comes from him, he can command anything, as long as he does so conformably with the Koran, and he is head of both Church and State, or rather Church and State are the same thing. Since then, like all great religions, they want to convert every one to the faith that they believe to be the only true one, they also want their Khalifah to rule temporally over all men as well. In theory, at any rate, you cannot be a real orthodox True Believer unless you obey the Khalifah in all things ; he is both Pope and Emperor, and as the whole world accepts Islam, so will all independent kings and princes be replaced by his Emirs.¹ That is the ideal. As a matter of fact they have not

¹ They are not always consistent to this ideal. In modern times especially they have at last been forced to recognize and treat with independent sovereigns. But it is curious to see how unwillingly they have climbed down from their original attitude. The first time they recognized another State was in 1535, when Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566) made a treaty with Francis I of France (1515-1547). In this treaty Suleiman is the "King of kings, the Sultan of earth and sea, the shadow of God" ; Francis is the "Honour of the princes of the faith of Jesus" (see De la Jonquière, *o.c.* p. 236). But even now a Moslem would of course say that the ideal is for every one to accept Islam, and that involves (to an orthodox Sunni Moslem) obeying the Khalifah of the Prophet in all things.

yet conquered the whole world. So the great division of all is between the House of Peace (*Dar al-Islām*), where Islam reigns, and the House of War (*Dar al-Harb*), that is, all parts not yet converted and submitted to the Khalifah. It will be understood, then, that they never want a pretext for making war on unbelievers. It is the right and the duty of all Moslems to convert (if necessary by force) all the House of War, to join it to the House of Peace in the obedience of the Khalifah. Such a process is one of the very first religious duties¹—the Holy War (*Jihad*), from which they are only excused when it is for a time impossible. Whereas, then, both Christians and Moslems wish to convert all unbelievers to their own faith, Christians can do so without changing the civil organization of any State, and the new converted Christians can and should go on fulfilling the same civil duties to a heathen Government as their heathen fellow-citizens. But the Mohammedan theory makes this impossible, and conversion to them involves political submission to their Khalifah—to convert is to conquer. When they have conquered a country they distinguish between the two kinds of unbelievers they may find there. First there may be *Kuffār* (Kafirs), that is idolaters or worshippers of false gods. They are to have no mercy. Either they accept Islam or they are killed. Secondly, Moslems may find in the conquered land people who worship the true God, though not in the right way. These people are the *Ahl al-Kitāb* (Kitabis)—“People of the Book.” Namely, God has given to men three successive revelations, each true and right while it lasted, though the two earlier ones have already been, and the present one will some day be, supplanted by a succeeding and more perfect one. Each of these revelations or religions has a book inspired by God. They are : The revelation of Moses, of which the book is the Old Testament, that of ‘Isa the son of Mariam (by which they mean our Lord), whose book is the New Testament, and that of Mohammed with his Koran. Some day

¹ So said the Prophet : “Finish my work, spread the House of Peace (Islam) all over the world ; God gives you the House of War ” (S. ix. 39). “ Oh True Believers, fight your neighbours if they be unbelievers, treat them severely ” (S. ix. 124).

the Mahdi will come and supplant Islam too.¹ Meanwhile it is the last and at present the true revelation. The People of the Book then are those who still follow one of the older revelations given before Islam, that is Jews and Christians, each of whom have a book to show for their belief.² And these Kitabis are not to be persecuted. "Fight those who do not believe in God and in the day of judgement (the Kafirs) . . . and those who have received the book shall pay you a poll-tax and be subject to you" (Sura ix. 29). The Kitabis were originally called *Dhimmis* ("protected ones") by the Arabs; the Turks call them *Rayahs* (*Ra'iyah*, Flock). They have to pay a poll-tax and a land-tax, they may not serve in the army. To convert a Moslem to their faith or seduce a Moslem woman, to speak openly against Islam, to make any treaty or alliance with people outside the Moslem Empire, is punished with death. The Rayahs must also dress differently from Moslems, may not have as high houses as their masters, nor expose any sign of their faith (crosses) outside their churches, nor ring church bells, nor bear arms, nor ride a saddled horse. A Rayah's evidence cannot be accepted in a court of law against a Moslem. If they obey these laws they are not to be in any way annoyed or molested; they may keep all their other customs and social arrangements, and are quite free with regard to their religion.³ Of course any Rayah may always accept Islam and thus enter the governing race; if he does so it is death to go back. These, then, were the conditions imposed upon all Christians and Jews by the Turks.⁴

¹ Or rather perfect Islam. The Sunni view of the Mahdi's office is almost exactly the same as the Christian view of our Lord's attitude towards the old law. The Shiah (Persian and heretical) Mahdi is to be simply the long-lost 12th Imam come out of hiding at last. See J. Darmesteter: *Le Mahdi* (Paris, 1885). Every Moslem pretender, usurper, rebel or reformer at once says he is the Mahdi.

² Afterwards the Persian Zoroastrians (Parsis) were recognized as Kitabis too, and their founder was added to the list of true prophets before Mohammed.

³ Their clergy were even exempt from the poll-tax. In Turkey the inevitable influence of Western ideas during the last century modified many of these rules.

⁴ For Moslem law on all these points see e.g. H. Grimme: *Mohammed, II Einleitung in den Koran* (Münster, 1895), *passim*, also E. V. Mulinen: *Die latein. Kirche im Türk. Reich*, pp. 1-4.

The only point added by them was what was certainly the worst of all—the tribute of children. A certain number of the strongest and healthiest Christian children of six or seven years old were taken away every year to supply the Sultan's Janissary (*yeni cheri*=new troop) guard. They were, of course, brought up as Moslems, knowing neither father nor mother nor country, having no attachment to anything or any one except to their barracks and the Sultan. So they formed a tremendous engine in the hands of the Government, and the Christians, whose lands were harried and whose homes were burnt by the Janissaries, had the additional horror of knowing that these persecutors were really their own children. The Janissary corps lasted till 1826. It was only then, after they, knowing their own strength, had become too utterly unruly, that Sultan Mahmud II (1808–1839) at the risk of his own life abolished them.¹ This most cruel piece of tyranny was not part of the law of Islam, but a special and private abomination of the Turk.

With this exception, however, the fate of the Rayahs was not the worst possible. What they had to complain of was, first, that they always remained a separate subject-people under a race of foreign conquerors and masters; and, secondly, that they were at the mercy of tyrants, who at any time could, and who continually did, overstep their own law. The root of the whole evil was that Christian and Moslem never could, never can mix into one people. There have been other conquests as cruel and as unjust as the Turkish conquest of the Empire, and yet in other cases after a century or two the races have mixed and no one either knows or cares any longer whether he belongs by blood to the original conquerors or conquered. This can never happen where Moslems rule over Christians. No one now asks whether an Englishman be Briton or real Englishman or Norman, whether an Italian be Roman or Goth or Lombard; but the Turk and the Rayah belong to two different nations to-day as much as in 1453. The difference of religion in this case makes a barrier that nothing can break down. Religion to the Moslem is the only thing that matters at all. Islam is the perfect example of a theocratic democracy, governed of course,

¹ The tribute of children was done away with in 1638.

like most democracies, by an irresponsible tyrant. Neither race nor language nor colour makes any difference.¹ All True Believers are equal and any one of them may rise to any position: the world of the Arabian Nights, in which barbers become Great Wazirs and pastry-cooks marry Sultans' daughters really exists (or did exist until the invasion of Western manners quite in our own time) round the Bosphorus. All Islam are brothers. But, on the other hand, people who are not True Believers are utterly shut out from the world in which Moslems live. They remain another nation, may be tolerated, and may exist side by side with their own laws, but they are always as remote from the governing class as another species. And to be a subject-nation governed by a foreign race is a position with which no civilized people can be finally satisfied. So there have been endless revolts among the Rayahs, and after a revolt the Turk has no mercy. That is why, in spite of the tolerance of Moslem law, the history of the Ottoman Empire in Europe has been one long, monotonous story of the shedding of Christian blood. The Rayahs have always been in revolt, and the Turks have always been massacring. It began when they slew steadily through the whole day as soon as they had entered Constantinople in 1453; it is going on to-day all over Macedonia. And there has been no change in between.

But even when they do not revolt the Rayahs have no certainty that the Turk will keep his own law. Selim I (1512-1520) in a fit of religious enthusiasm suddenly ordered all churches to be turned into mosques and all Rayahs to become True Believers under pain of death (1520). With infinite difficulty the Patriarch Jeremias I persuaded him to obey the command of his own Prophet. Murad III (1574-1595) and Mohammed III (1595-1603) both nearly carried out the same plan. In Crete in 1670, fifteen thousand Christian children were taken from their

¹ The Ottoman Turks are now an almost entirely artificial race, as far removed from the original Turanians who came into Asia Minor in the 13th century as modern Turkish with its elaborately artificial forms and gigantic loans from Persian and Arabic (it has swallowed the grammars of both these languages besides its own) is from the rude dialect they brought with them from Central Asia. Any one can turn Turk by accepting Islam.

homes, circumcised and brought up as Moslems. Throughout Asia Minor, where the Turk has always been very anxious to Ottomanize the whole population, the punishment for speaking Greek was to have one's tongue torn out. Of course thousands of Rayahs did apostatize ; and in the purely artificial medley of races who, joined by the profession of Islam, make up the Turkish people there is a great proportion of Greek and Slav (that is originally Christian) blood. On the other hand, it is the eternal glory of the Orthodox people that as a people it has remained faithful. This is the most wonderful fact of the history of the Eastern Churches. These Rayahs, cut off from the West by the schism, forgotten by civilized Europe, ignorant and miserable, a servile race, paying for their faith by taxes, disabilities, degrading humiliations, and the sacrifice of their own children, always exposed to the violence of their masters, having every possible advantage to gain by turning Turk, yet kept their faith throughout those centuries of oppression. And what they suffered, how many thousands of them shed their blood for the name of Christ during those long dark ages, God only knows. But we, who have never had to sit under the shadow of the Sultan's blood-stained throne, if we remember the ugly story of their fathers' schism must also remember how valiantly the Eastern Christians have stood for Christ ever since, and how in the days of her trial the Byzantine Church, once so foolish and obstinate, has sent that long procession of her children to join the white-robed army of martyrs.

3. The Porte and the Christian Churches.

As soon as the Turks settled down after their conquest they began to organize the subject-peoples. They classified them naturally according to their religions. Our idea that there is one law for all and that a man's religion, as far as the State is concerned, is his own private affair only is one that the Turk has never understood. Moslems are the dominant race directly under the Sublime Porte.¹ And the Rayahs, too, must be organ-

¹ Sublime Porte means in English, High Gate. The Gate is a very common Semitic idiom for Government. The Gates of Hell in Mt. xvi. 18 mean simply the devil's government ; judgement was given and laws were

ized according to their various "nations." By *millet* (nation) the Turk means simply religion. This use of this word alone shows their whole attitude. The subject-nations then were (and are) : first, and by far the largest, the *Roman nation* (rum millet). And the Roman nation (strange survival of the name of the dead Empire) is nothing else than the Orthodox Church, under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Every Orthodox Rayah in Turkey, no matter of what descent, belongs to the Roman nation. Next in size come the *Armenian nation* (ermenî millet), who are the Monophysite (Gregorian) Armenians and the *Armenian Catholic nation* (ermenî katulik millet), that is the Uniates. The other Monophysites (Jacobites, Copts, and a few Abyssinians) are represented by the Armenian Monophysite Patriarch of Constantinople, all other Uniates (katulik) by the Armenian Catholic Patriarch. Then comes the *Jewish nation* (yahudi millet), nearly all Sephardim from Spain,¹ and lastly the *Latin nation* (latin millet), Catholics of the Latin rite.² The few native Protestants (mostly converted Armenians and a very few Syrians) are not a millet. The Porte will not allow them to be one, and they form a small irregular organization under the Minister of Police.³ In this way, then, all the Rayahs were classified and arranged in groups. Since each "nation" is a religious body, it is natural that, when the Porte looked for responsible heads and representatives of the nations under it, it should have fixed on their ecclesiastical superiors. This quite agrees with the view of the Moslems, who always confuse civil and spiritual authority ; and indeed there was no one else to

proclaimed at the gates of the city (cf. Job v. 4, Is. xxix. 21, Prov. xxii. 22), also the strength of a city was in its high strong gates. The metaphor of keys for authority is the same idea. The "Holy and True one" has the key of David "to open and no one shall shut, to shut and no one shall open" (Apoc. iii. 7), and our Lord gives St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Mt. xvi. 19), that is, supreme authority in his Church. The High Gate (*al-Bâb al-'âli*) then in Arabic means simply the Supreme Government, and the Turks have taken this expression, like almost every idea they have, from the Arabs.

¹ Under the Chacham bashi (Chief Rabbi).

² The Turk uses the word *katulik* for Uniates and *latin* for Latin Catholics.

³ The difficulty in organizing these Protestants is that they have no hierarchy and so the Porte does not know how to arrange them.

choose. So the Œcumenical Patriarch became the recognized *civil* head of the Roman nation.

4. The Porte and the Œcumenical Patriarch.

It is strange that the last step in the advancement of the Patriarch of Constantinople should be due to the Turkish conquest. He now takes something like the place the Emperor would have taken, if Constantine had not preferred a glorious death to the shame of being a tributary prince under the Sultan. And so the Patriarch reached the highest point of his career. When we first met him he was not a patriarch at all, nor even a metropolitan, but only a local bishop under Thrace. Now he has an enormous patriarchate covering all Russia, Turkey in Europe, and Asia Minor ; in ecclesiastical affairs he has precedence and something very like jurisdiction over the other Eastern patriarchs, and in civil affairs he has authority over them and all Orthodox Christians.¹ Only he must humble himself before the Sultan, and to make this degradation quite complete he is invested with the signs of his spiritual jurisdiction by the unbaptized tyrant who is his lord. The patriarchs, although they held so great a place over Christians, have always been made to feel that they are nothing before the Turk. They represent the enormous majority of subjects of the Porte in Europe, but they have never been given even the smallest place in the Diwan, that is, the Sultan's advising council. And the Sultans have deposed them, reappointed them, even killed them, just as they liked. On the whole, then, for a Christian bishop the place of a small diocesan ordinary, from which the Patriarchs of Constantinople rose, was more dignified than the servile grandeur they now enjoy. And, as we shall see, the last epoch of this history is the story of how they have lost their authority piece by piece, till at the present

¹ The highest point of his advancement in the Balkans was after 1765, when he had crushed the three independent Churches of Bulgaria, Serbia, and Roumania (pp. 307, 317, 328), but Russia had been independent since 1591 (p. 294). The decline of the Patriarch's power began with the independence of the Greek Church in 1833 (p. 312).

moment the Œcumenical Patriarchate is only a shadow of what it once was.

The See of Constantinople was vacant during the last troubled years of the falling Empire. Athanasius II had been elected in 1450 and had resigned at once. When the first storm of the conquest was over and the Turks at last rested from the massacre of May 29th, Mohammed II realized that, now that he had at last taken New Rome, he did not want to reign over deserted ruins. So he ordered the slaying of Christians to stop, and persuaded those who had fled and hidden themselves to come back. He promised them the usual conditions of Rayahs and set to work to organize his conquest. He seized the finest churches (this was directly forbidden by his own law); the Hagia Sophia was whitewashed all over, the names of the Prophet and the first Khalifahs were hung up on huge round boards over the old ikons, the altar and Ikonostasis were destroyed, and a Mihrab to show the direction of Mecca was fixed in the apse, the Church of the Holy Apostles (in which the Emperors since Constantine had been buried) was razed to the ground to make room for a mosque, and any other churches the conquerors wanted were seized too.

Mohammed, however, took care to have a new patriarch elected; he made the metropolitans choose George Scholarios, because he was a bitter enemy of the union. Scholarios became Gennadios II (1453-1456). When he was elected Mohammed sent for him and said: "Be patriarch, and may Heaven protect you. You may always count on my favour, and you shall enjoy all the rights of your predecessors," and then, copying the custom of the Emperors, he solemnly invested him with the signs of his office and gave him a diploma (*berat*) exactly defining his rights. All the patriarchs since have submitted to this same degrading ceremony, and have received, each one as soon as he is elected, the *berat*, that declares him an Imperial Ottoman functionary. Although the Sultan allowed the old form of election to go on, there was no pretence about the fact that it depended simply on his will; as he deposed patriarchs so did he appoint them. Very often after having been deposed for a time the same man was re-elected. This has happened as

often as five times (pp. 265, 267) ; there seem to have been nearly always, as there are at this moment, three or four ex-patriarchs living at the same time. None of them reigned more than a year or two, and so the number of Patriarchs of Constantinople since 1453 is quite incredible. For instance, during the seventy-five years from 1625 to 1700 there were fifty patriarchs—an average of eighteen months each.

The last and worst result of the subjection of the Church to the Moslem tyrant was Simony. Each patriarch had to make the Sultan an enormous present of money in return for his appointment ; to raise this money they then sold all benefices to their bishops and priests, and so the taint of Simony, the buying and selling of the things of God, has been for centuries one of the characteristic marks of the Orthodox Church. However, when he had bought his *berat* from the Sultan and had swallowed as best he could the shame of the investiture, the Patriarch became, as far as his fellow-Rayahs were concerned, a great lord. The spiritual rights given to him by the *berat* were : Full authority over all churches and convents, and in all questions of faith, discipline, or rites, the right to depose any unworthy bishop or other clerk in his patriarchate, the right to hand over to the Porte contumacious clerks for punishment. Most of these rights he uses only in union with his synod. As head of the Roman nation the Patriarch judged all questions of marriage law and all disputes between Orthodox Christians, in which both sides had agreed to sue at his court.¹ He could levy taxes from his nation for ecclesiastical purposes, and could keep a small number of gendarmes at his service.² Neither he nor any clerks paid any taxes to the Porte at all, and he was the official representative of the other Orthodox patriarchs at the Court. Until quite lately the Byzantine patriarchate was enormously rich. All property of bishops or other celibate clerks who died intestate

¹ Most of these rights were shared in a less degree by other bishops as well. The other "nations" had similar arrangements.

² These civil rights have now disappeared. A Turkish law in 1856 did away with them and established "mixed councils" of Turks and Christians to try cases formerly settled by bishops. The ecclesiastical arrangements of the Orthodox Church have been modified too, since 1860 (p. 338).

came to it ; also regular taxes from the clergy, the simoniacal purchase-money for all bishoprics and other benefices, heavy stole-fees, legacies, and the ordinary endowments of the See of Constantinople made up a very great income. On the other hand the disbursements, and especially the heavy bribe each patriarch had to pay to the Sultan for his appointment, and for the sake of which the Sultan took care to change the occupier of the see as often as possible, made a steadily growing debt. This debt, called the court-debt (τὰ αὐλικά), was met by an additional tax on the clergy ; and so the Orthodox bishops and priests, who were free from taxes to the Porte, found that the payments they had to make to the Phanar left them on the whole in a worse case than laymen.

The patriarchate, having lost the cathedral of the Holy Wisdom, was first set up at the church of the Pammakaristos ("the All-blessed one," our Lady) ; Murad III (1574-1595) in 1586 turned this into a mosque, and the Patriarch moved to St. Demetrios's Church. In 1603 he moved again to St. George's Church, where he still remains. This church of St. George is the centre of the Greek quarter of Constantinople, the *Phanar* (so called from the old lighthouse), on the bank of the Golden Horn, behind the city. The *Phanar* has been ever since the centre of the Orthodox Church, and the name is used for its government, much as we speak of the Vatican. It has also been the centre of the Greek people under the Turk ; the rich Phanariote merchants who live around the seat of the patriarchate have always been the leaders of their countrymen ; they pride themselves on speaking the purest Greek, their strong national feeling has formed the nucleus of the hatred of Slav, Roumanian, and Bulgar, that is still the chief note of Greek policy, and even now that part of their people are independent, Greeks all over the world look, not to Athens and the Danish Protestant who reigns there, but to the Phanar as the centre, and to the Œcumenical Patriarch as the chief of their race.*

We shall come back to the Phanar and the organization of

* A Greek said to Professor Gelzer in 1898 : "Le chef de notre nation n'est pas ce petit roitelet à Athènes, mais le patriarche œcuménique" (Gelzer : *Geistliches u. Weltliches aus dem Türk-Griech. Orient*, p. 24).

the patriarchate when we come to the state of the Orthodox Church to-day (p. 338). Meanwhile it is only fair to remember that much of the degradation of the patriarchal throne during the long dark ages of Turkish oppression was not the fault, but the very great misfortune of the Christians. And many of those patriarchs who had to serve the tyrant so basely stood out valiantly against him when it came to a point that no Christian possibly could concede. Gennadios's immediate successor, Isidore II (1456-1463), was murdered for refusing to allow a Christian woman to become the second wife of a Moslem. Maximos III (1476-1482) was mutilated for the same cause, and so there have been many confessors of the faith on the patriarchal throne down to the martyr-patriarch, Gregory V (p. 341).

Summary.

The great turning-point of history for the Orthodox Christians after the schism was the Turkish conquest of their lands that ended with the taking of Constantinople on May 29, 1453. The old Roman Empire then ended with the glorious death of the last Emperor, Constantine XII. The Christian subjects of the Porte, called Rayahs, were allowed to keep their religion and customs, and were tolerated as an inferior and subject race. But they continually tried to revolt, and were each time cruelly put down; even when they did not revolt the Turks often broke their own law and persecuted them. The Porte organized all the Rayahs in different nations, meaning thereby religions, and each nation was put under its ecclesiastical head in civil matters too. So the Œcumenical Patriarch became the civil head of his people, thus gaining even more authority. But he was degraded by having to be invested by the Sultan, and each patriarch was forced to pay a heavy bribe for his appointment; from this beginning Simony became a characteristic of every rank in the Church. The patriarchs were very rich, but the Sultan changed them continually for the sake of the bribes. During the centuries of Turkish tyranny the Rayahs kept their faith, and thousands of them suffered valiantly for Christ.

CHAPTER IX

ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

THE Orthodox Church during the four centuries of Turkish oppression naturally sank to a low level of culture. One cannot expect any great theological movements, nor look for the names of famous scholars in a community that was ground down as were the Rayahs before the more tolerant laws of the 19th century. The one duty of the Orthodox, then, was to keep their faith in spite of everything, and this they did very nobly.

However, their Church was not really quite dead. She produced some theologians ; was very conscious of her own position when the Protestants wanted to make an alliance with her, and she was on one occasion convulsed by a really serious trouble in the affair of Cyril Lukaris. These three points now require some notice.

I. Theologians since 1453.

The names of a few of the theologians whose works are still read over there, and who enjoy a reputation as classical exponents of the Orthodox faith, ought at least to be mentioned. These theologians all studied at the Western universities : there were no means of education in Turkey. Venice had a large colony of Greeks ; and Greek students came to Padua, Pisa, Florence, Paris, Oxford, even Rome.

Since the Council of Florence there have always been a number of Eastern Christians of every rite who have accepted its decrees and who therefore, while keeping the liturgies, rites,

and customs of their fathers, acknowledge the Roman Primacy, and are in communion with the Holy See. These Catholics of Eastern rites are called Uniates, and for the Greek and Ruthenian Uniates Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585) founded the Greek College at Rome. Of the students of the Greek College the greater part of course remained Uniates when they went back to their own country and worked for the cause of the Pope; but some afterwards joined the majority and turned Orthodox. So the Pope's College at Rome has the quite undesired honour of being remembered by Orthodox historians as one of the Western sources from which their fathers drew the knowledge that adorned in them the Orthodox Church. The Greek colony at Venice was the first to found an Orthodox school. Thomas Phlangenes of Kerkyra established the Academy, called after him the Phlangenion, in 1626; it lasted till 1795, and was the central home of their theology during that time. At last, in the 18th century, the Phanar managed to set up colleges and schools at home. The great "School of the Nation" (σχολή τοῦ γένους) at Constantinople was the first of these; then Smyrna, Janina, Mount Athos, Bucharest, and other towns had schools too.

Most, indeed nearly all, of the work of the Orthodox theologians during this time has been written against the Pope and the Latins. One can understand this. To the Eastern Christians the enormously greater, more powerful, and more prosperous Catholic Church looms very large; the question why they are not in union with the bishop, who should be the first of the patriarchs, is always the burning one. And the Popes have never ceased trying to convert them back: papal missionaries and schools are to be found all over Eastern Europe (except, of course, in Russia); there has always been a Latinizing party among the Orthodox, and they continually hear of some priest or bishop, sometimes of whole communities, that have made their submission to the Pope. So to people who believe that the claims of the Holy See rest upon nothing but a monstrous tissue of lies and forgeries, who look upon the Papacy as something almost diabolical (and many of these Orthodox writers hate Rome as violently as the wildest Protestants), to

such people as this naturally the first duty is to justify their schism, to defend themselves against papal aggression ; Rome is the greatest, the most untiring, the most dangerous enemy. They dare not try to convert Turks ; Protestants have not interfered with them very much on the whole (though there has been trouble on this side too, see p. 254), the unorthodox Eastern Churches are quite harmless—no one ever thinks of changing from Orthodox to Jacobite or Copt—so the great question of all, here as all over the Christian world, is that of the enormous united communion that may be hated but cannot be ignored. Still from any point of view the fact that they have done hardly anything but discuss us all this time is a disadvantage. Controversy is never the highest kind of theological literature, and certainly one reason why Orthodox theology is so very far behind ours is that while Catholics during the last four centuries have written on every branch of theology, and have elaborated their system from every conceivable point of view, the others have been doing scarcely anything but fussing over and over again about the Filioque and the Primacy, and repeating the feeble accusations they always ferret out against our rites and customs. Another difference that is very clearly marked is between the rigid consistency of Catholic theology and the really amazing confusion of their ideas. We noticed the germ of this difference long ago (p. 110), and we shall come back to some startling examples of it later (p. 384 *seq.*).

In the 15th century the only Orthodox theologian was *Maximos Peloponnesios* (Maximos III of Constantinople, 1476–1482). He opens the tradition of the whole school by writing against the Council of Florence and a “Refutation of the Seven Chapters which were written by one of the Western Frati.”¹ It is not known who his Western Frate was.

In the 16th century the chief writer is *Meletios Pegas* (Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς, 1535–1603).² He was a Cretan who studied at

¹ Μαξίμου τοῦ Πελοποννησίου Ἀπολόγοι ἡ ἀνατροπὴ τῶν ζ' κεφαλαίων ἅπερ ἐπεμψέ τις τῶν δυτικῶν φρατέρων. Φρατῶρ is an engaging word, meaning Frater. Of course he is not going to call a Latin Ἱερομόναχος.

² Meyer, *o.c.* pp. 53–69. Kyriakos, iii. p. 136.

Padua, and then became Patriarch of Alexandria (1590-1603). Leo Allatius had known him, and it was he who sent Lukaris to Poland (p. 264). His chief work bears the rather ponderous title: "A writing of the most blessed the Pope of Great Alexandria, Lord Meletios, concerning this: which is the true Catholic Church, and who is her legitimate and real Head, and concerning the origin of the Pope of Rome, dedicated to the most holy Silvester his (Meletios's) predecessor and elder."¹ As the title says, this book is a polemical work against the Pope's claim. The legitimate and true Head of the Church is our Lord; the true Catholic Church is made up of all those who acknowledge this, apparently including Latins and "those from Luther." It is the beginning of a sort of branch-theory that was not destined to survive among Orthodox theologians. Meletios Pegas also wrote an "Orthodox Christian Dialogue," a letter to Sigismund III of Poland in Latin against the Roman Primacy, and a number of other works, nearly all of which, except one treatise against the Jews, are directed against Catholic belief and rites. His idea of the origin of the patriarchates is curious. Constantine made Rome and Constantinople patriarchal sees. As they then were jealous of one another, and always quarrelled, Alexandria was also made a patriarchate to judge between them;² then Jerusalem was put in the lowest place among the patriarchal sees out of love for the holy places, but also because Christ who had lived there was so humble. He seems to have forgotten Antioch.³ *Jeremias II* of Constantinople (1572-1579, restored 1580-1584; restored again 1586-1595) is famous chiefly because of his correspondence with the Tübingen Protestants (p. 252). But he also wrote against the Latins. He protested against the use of the Gregorian Calendar which Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585) had introduced in the West, and which some Greeks

Printed in the *Τόμος χαρᾶς* of Dositheos of Jerusalem, 1705, pp. 553-604.

² The title "Judge of the Universe" is borne by the Patriarch of Alexandria (see p. 349).

³ In his second letter (to the Orthodox Russians in Poland, 1597), printed at Constantinople in 1627; see Leo Allatius, *de perp. cons.*, p. 996, and Meyer, *o.c.* p. 64.

wanted to adopt; he wrote an answer to "The Prince of Little Venice" (Nicholas Daponte)¹ who had proposed as a general principle that Catholics and Orthodox should keep the same feasts, protested against the leave given by the Porte to the Jesuits to come to Constantinople, and generally showed himself to be, as Manuel Malaxos in his History calls him, "a Pontiff just, irreproachable, true, godly, merciful, holy, not-bad, and pure." The Bishop of Kythera (the large island close to the south of the Peloponnesus), *Maximos Margunios* (Μαργούνιος, † 1602), who lived chiefly at Venice, was really anxious to restore the union. But the only way that seemed possible to him was by converting the Latins from their heresy about the procession of the Holy Ghost. So nearly all his writings ("Three books concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost," "Handbook of the Procession of the Holy Ghost," "Arguments against the Latins," "Dialogue between a Greek and a Latin"²) are defences of their view on this question. He was a very zealous and pious person, and wrote so moderately and charitably against us that he got into trouble with his own friends as a disguised Latinizer. Really he was nothing of the kind, and he never wavered for a moment from the Orthodox position. So great was his zeal that he, like other good people, went all the way to Rome on the rather hopeless errand of trying to convert the Pope (Clement VIII, 1592-1605). Clement appears to have received him quite kindly,³ and he argued and argued. Then he went back to Venice. *Manuel Malaxos* († c. 1581), sometime notary of the Metropolitan of Thebes in Bœotia, and then a private tutor at Constantinople, wrote a "History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople."⁴ A contemporary description of him is not flattering: "This is a very old man; he teaches boys in a small and wretched house by the Patriarch's palace. He hangs up dried fishes in it, and then eats them. He writes

¹ Πρίγκηψ τῶν κλεινῶν Βενετίων. I do not know why he calls the Serenissima "Little Venice," unless it is just rudeness.

² Meyer, pp. 69-78. He doubts the authenticity of the Dialogue.

³ Kyriakos's statement that the Inquisition threatened him, and that he had to flee for his life (iii. p. 137) is a mistake; the Serenissima gave him a safe-conduct, which was scrupulously observed (Meyer, p. 71).

⁴ Printed in M. Crusius: *Turcogræcia* (Basel, 1584), pp. 107-184.

books for money, and spends it all on wine. He is fat and hearty."¹

In the 17th century the most important person was *Cyril Lukaris* (p. 264). After him one should mention *Metrophanes Kritopulos* († 1641), who was sent by Lukaris to study at Oxford and at the German universities. He became Patriarch of Alexandria in 1630, and wrote a "Confession of the Orthodox Church"² (p. 364). *Peter Mogilas* († 1647) was a Moldavian who became Metropolitan of Kiev in Russia. He wrote in Latin³ an "Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church," which was very soon done into Greek, was accepted by the Patriarchs as an authentic statement of their faith, and has always been one of the chief Orthodox symbolic books⁴ (p. 364). *Gabriel Seberos* († 1616), *George Koresios* († 1641), *Meletios Syrigos* († 1662), *Nektarios*, Patriarch of Jerusalem († 1676), all acquired some name as theologians by writing against Latin heresies.⁵

The greatest Greek scholar of the 18th century was, without question, *Eugenios Bulgaris* (Εὐγένιος Βούλγαρις, † 1800). He was born in Kerkyra, and studied at Padua. Then he taught philosophy at Janina and at the new school founded at Mount Athos; eventually he was called to Russia by Catharine II (1762-1796) and made Archbishop of Cherson (not far from Odessa). Bulgaris was a philologist,⁶ theologian, and especially philosopher. He was the first man who introduced modern philosophy to the Greek world, and what he taught was an eclectic combination of Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke, &c. It was because of this that he was rather persecuted. At that time to the Orthodox, as intermittently to Catholics, the only Christian philosophy was Aristotle. The Athos monks drove him out with contumely as an atheist and blasphemer. Besides

¹ Gerlach in Meyer, p. 162.

² Kyriakos, iii. p. 138.

³ For a very long time, and even now to some extent, Latin is the learned language in Russia. See Palmer's *Visit*, p. 299, &c.

⁴ Meyer in the *Realenz.* s.v. *Mogilas* (1903, vol. xiii. pp. 249-253).

⁵ Kyriakos, iii. pp. 137-139.

⁶ He is said to have spoken fluently Greek, Latin, German, Italian, French, Hebrew, Turkish, Arabic, and Russian—which is a very good record.

his philosophical works he wrote on mathematics and astronomy, translated various foreign books into Greek (Ps.-Augustine : *Soliloquia*, &c.), did the *Æneid* into Homeric Hexameters ; wrote a Compendium of Theology, and of course added to his many-sided collection of writings a treatise "On the Procession of the Holy Ghost" and a "Little Book against the Latins."

Bulgaris was an ardent Philhellene, and may be looked upon as the father of the modern Orthodox school. Nearly all the writers of the 19th century learned directly or indirectly from him. He was also the father of the much-discussed fashion of writing as near an imitation of old Attic Greek as possible, forming an artificial literary language to take the place of the common speech of his time.¹ Other Greek theologians of the 18th century were *Elias Meniates* († 1714), who wrote a work called "The Stumbling-block" (Πέτρα σκανδάλου = Rock of scandal, a delicate allusion to the name Peter), which is, one need hardly say, the Roman See, also *Athanasios Komnenos Hypsilantes* († c. 1789), *Alexander Helladios*, *Meletios of Fanina* († 1714), who all cooked up again the everlasting arguments against the Filioque and our habits generally. We shall come to some writers of the 19th century later (p. 315). Meanwhile these few names will serve to show that Greek letters were not altogether dead during these ages, although their life lingered almost exclusively in anti-Catholic polemics.

¹ Modern Greek has gradually lost very many of the old inflections (future, optative, all duals, &c.) ; has made many forms regular (μεγάλος, μέγλη, μεγάλο, είμαι, είσαι, είναι, κ.τ.λ.) ; has adopted any number of Turkish and Italian words (τουφέκι, a gun, λουλουδάκι, flower, σοφάς, sofa, κατσαρόλα, saucepan, &c.) ; and has recklessly simplified the grammar (nearly all prepositions with accusatives, &c.). The question still hugely agitated all over the Greek world is what to do with this tongue. There are three schools : (1) To restore Attic Greek and make classical compound words for new things (σιδηρόδρομος, railway, ατμόπλοιοι, steamer) ; (2) to cast out the foreign words and leave the rest alone ; (3) to leave it all alone, and use this modern dialect as a literary language. The Phanar has a tradition of very respectable Byzantine Greek, which may be compared to our Church Latin. So in Greece the porter talks to you in a language you must learn anew just as much as Turkish, the bishop talks like St. John Chrysostom, and the schoolmaster like Demosthenes. The parish priest wavers, but greatly tends to gravitate towards the porter. The classical work on new Greek philology is Hatzidakis : *Einleitung in die neugriech. Gramm.* Leipzig, 1892. For Bulgaris, see Kyriakos, iii. p. 143, seq.

2. The Orthodox and the Lutherans.

It was natural that, soon after the Reformation, the Protestants, who had thrown off the Pope's authority, should remember and try to set up relations with the people in the East of Europe who, as far as this point went, had already for centuries stood in the same position. It is to the credit of the conservative spirit of the Orthodox Church that she has always refused communion with any religious body except on terms of the complete acceptance of the Orthodox faith. As we shall see, she believes herself to be the whole and only real Church of Christ, just as Catholics do. So any sort of alliance with other Churches on mutual terms is impossible, and the idea, often cherished, of building up a great united anti-papal Church to rival and balance the Catholic body has always broken down because of her refusal, as well as for other reasons.

The first in this field were the Lutherans. A certain Demetrios Mysos was studying at Wittenberg in the 16th century ; when he went back to Constantinople, Philip Melanchthon († 1560) gave him a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession, and a letter to the Patriarch Joasaph II (1555-1565). Nothing came of this. The Tübingen theologians made a much more important attempt.¹ In 1574 James Andreä and Martin Crusius, both professors at that university, sent to Jeremias II (p. 248) another translation of the Augsburg Confession with a mightily civil letter asking him for his opinion of it. Jeremias answered, giving his opinion, which was, of course, simply the most categorical re-statement of the Orthodox faith (1575). He blames the Filioque (one can never understand why Protestants have kept the Filioque), baptism by infusion (see p. 420), their denial of Transubstantiation, penance, prayers for the dead, prayers to Saints, and religious orders. In one point especially a greater gulf separated the Reformers from the Orthodox than from Catholics. The Protestants made Justification by Faith alone one of their chief dogmas : and the Orthodox belief was and is

¹ All the acts of this history in *Acta theologorum Vitenb.* See also the article Jeremias II in the *Realenz.* (1900, viii. p. 660, *seq.*), and Renaudin : *Luthériens et Grecs-Orthodoxes.*

at the very extreme other end of the scale in this matter (p. 108). Jeremias exposes what is really pure semi-Pelagianism ("a man must first determine himself to what is good, and then God gives him grace ; otherwise there would be no free will"¹). Lastly, he insists on tradition as a source of revelation.

Luke Osiander answered this letter in 1577, refuting each of the Patriarch's arguments from the Protestant point of view ; the Patriarch wrote back and refuted Osiander, and then Osiander answered refuting the Patriarch. By this time, then, the correspondence, which had been meant to lead to an alliance, had become simply a rather acrimonious controversy. So, in 1581, Jeremias did a very sensible thing. He wrote, saying that evidently they would never agree : they started from different principles, and it was no good arguing any more. He would be very pleased to hear from them again if they would write for love (*φιλίας ἔνεκα*), but he did not want any more Protestant theology. Whether the Tübingers wrote him any letters for love I do not know ; but that was the end of the attempt at a Lutheran-Orthodox union from Tübingen. Another abortive attempt was made in Poland in 1599. Both Protestants and Orthodox were then being much worried by the Catholic kings, and so the Protestants wrote to the Œcumenical Patriarch, proposing a defensive alliance against the common enemy, Popery. Meletios Pegas (p. 247), who happened to be then administrator of the vacant See of Constantinople (1597-1599), answered by asking them if they were prepared to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Œcumenical throne. They, of course, said certainly not. What they proposed was to give the Patriarch the right hand of friendship, as St. Paul gave it to the elder Apostles. But to take the right hand of friendship in ecclesiastical matters from people outside his communion is as impossible for the Patriarch as for the Pope. So Meletios could only answer that he was sorry to find them schismatics and heretics, and that he would be glad to hear from them again as soon as they were prepared to join the Orthodox Church. The great affair of Lukaris (p. 264) is connected with this question of Orthodox and Protestants. Count Zinzendorf († 1760), the founder of the

¹ See Kyriakos, iii. p. 87.

Moravian Brethren sect, again opened negotiations with the Patriarch Neophytos VI (1734-1740, and again, 1743-1744) in 1737. But Zinzendorf practically wanted to make Neophytos a Moravian, and Neophytos quite openly wanted to make Zinzendorf Orthodox, and, of course, neither succeeded. However, so far the Easterns had not been ill-disposed towards Protestants; in spite of the most radical disagreements, their common opposition to the Pope was a great tie of sympathy. What crushed all friendly feeling was the Protestant missionizing in the East. The Orthodox hate any attempt at proselytizing among their people above measure. In the first place, like Catholics, they hold their communion to be the whole and only true Church. So to be an apostate from it is to them, as to us in our case, an infinitely greater calamity than the loss of members to the Protestant bodies, who all claim to be only a branch of the Church, although, of course, always the best and purest branch. And then, to the Easterns their communion is not only the true Church, it is their nation as well. We have seen how the only national organizations they have under the Turk are the religious bodies. The Orthodox Church is the *Roman nation*, and every true son of Hellas must belong to that nation. It is their one bond; it has kept alive the sacred fire of Greek patriotism during the centuries of bondage; it has been the rallying point of the "Love of Hellas" under the barbarian. The metropolitans and priests have been leaders, patrons, protectors of the Rayahs when there was no one else to care for them; and when the first whisper of liberty went abroad, it was from the bishops' houses, the monasteries, the poor cottages of the Papades, that the people heard the summons to try once more and to strike for Christ and Hellas.¹ The Orthodox Church is the heir of all the Greek traditions.

¹ These two causes always went together :—

Γιὰ τῆς πατρίδος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν,
 Γιὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἁγίαν,
 Γι' αὐτὰ τὰ δύο πολεμῶ,
 Μ' αὐτὰ νὰ ζήσω ἐπιθυμῶ,
 Κί ἂν δὲν τὰ ἀποκτήσω
 Τί μ' ὠφελεῖ νὰ ζήσω ;

The old glories of the free Greek States, vague memories of Marathon and Salamis, the majesty of the Roman Empire, their cause against Persian and Arab, Frank and Turk—it is all gathered together and still lives in the Holy Apostolic Orthodox Catholic Church of the Seven Councils. So one can understand how they feel about a renegade from that Church : he betrays the true faith of Christ, and he betrays the cause of the Fatherland. And one can understand, too, how the Church resents attempts at seducing her children. She trained them, protected them, and cared for them all through the long, dark days that are at last just passing, and now people come over from across the seas to try to make them leave her. And yet the Orthodox Church is unceasingly harried by missionaries of other religions. The Catholic missions—Jesuits, Franciscans, and so on—have been her bugbear for centuries. Of course, the Catholic Church cannot act otherwise. Since the basis of her whole position is that she is the only true Church, to which God wishes all men to be called, she will never, and can never, cease sending out missionaries, whose work is to try to convert any and every human being who is outside her communion, whether heathen, Mohammedan, Protestant, or Orthodox. It is the obvious and perfectly consistent policy she follows throughout the world, and which any reasonable person who understands her faith must always expect. At any rate, one must expect the Holy See to believe in the Roman Catholic claims, and to complain of the Pope because he does not act according to theories which are the exact contrary of his faith is mere foolishness. But one must see an Orthodox paper to understand what they think of the Roman Propaganda,¹ which, instead of converting the heathen (!), sends out wolves and serpents to ruin other Christian Churches. And when Protestant missionaries began to come out, too, to help their Catholic enemies rend Orthodox lambs, then even the precious bond of the fact that they were all against the Pope was no longer enough to make Orthodox and Protestants friends. The trouble began with the Bible societies. Various English, American,

¹ They will not translate this word, but they spell it out in Greek letters, ἡ προπαγάνδα, which, for some unaccountable reason, looks perfectly fiendish.

and German societies printed and distributed Greek and Russian Bibles.¹ At first the Orthodox Hierarchy saw no harm in that, and even approved and blessed the work. A Greek society for the distribution of Holy Scripture was formed in 1818 to work in union with the British and Foreign Bible Society. But it soon became evident that the tendency of these societies was inconsistent with the Orthodox faith. In 1840 a new modern Greek Bible appeared in London. And now their Protestantism was manifest. This version was done straight from the Massoretic text, ignoring the Septuagint, and it left out the Deuterocanonical books.² At the same time schools were being set up in the chief towns under Protestant teachers, and their pupils began to seek a purer faith by attending Evangelical prayer meetings. Then there came conventicles with Bible classes, pleasant Sunday afternoons, hymn-books provided and Gospel teas. An American—King—at Athens was the chief of these missionaries. So at last the Patriarch (Gregory VI, 1835–1840 and 1867–1871), in a synod of the year 1836, forbade the use of these Bibles, and very properly excommunicated all who attended the Protestant meeting-houses. Since then there has been no persecution of the missionaries. They have set up centres all over the Near East, and no one prevents them from preaching ; but every one now knows that to join them is to leave the Orthodox Church. In Russia, where other ideas of liberty prevail, the Bible Society was expelled, and its Bibles forbidden. These Protestants have made an infinitesimal number of converts, who call themselves *Εὐαγγελικοί*, and the Orthodox feel nearly as bitter towards non-Anglican Protestants (*Διαμαρτυρόμενοι*) as towards Catholics.³

¹ New Testament in modern Greek, London (British and Foreign Bible Society), 1810, Bible in Russian, 1821, and then continually reprinted.

² The LXX has always been the official version of the Byzantine Church, as the Vulgate is ours. Protestants, on the other hand, make quite a fetish of the Massora. But to print a Greek Bible without using the LXX is an almost incredible piece of arrogance and absurdity. Two Englishmen made this new version and thought they could do better than the LXX !

³ For the story of the Bible societies, see Kyriakos, iii. pp. 97–103, and for Russia, Palmer, p. 521.

3. The Orthodox and the Anglicans.

The relations of the Orthodox Church to the Church of England, of late years especially, have been very much more friendly than towards any other religious body, except, perhaps, the Armenians. The first connection was in the affair of Lukaris. Naturally, it has always been the High Church party in England that has wished for union with the Orthodox. In 1672 the Eastern Patriarchs sent a document to England to answer the question : "What are the sentiments of the Eastern Church ?" In 1677 Henry Compton, Bishop of London, built a church in his own city (St. Mary, Crown Street, Soho) "for the nation of the Greeks," and in 1694 Worcester College, Oxford (then Gloucester Hall), was to be a Greek College, although nothing came of this plan. In 1710, Samuel Kapazules, Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, finding his see in great financial difficulties, sent out people to all parts of the world to collect alms for it. Two of these collectors, Arsenios, Metropolitan of the Thebais, and Gennadios, Archimandrite at Alexandria, come to England with letters from Samuel to Queen Anne. They arrive in 1714, and Anne gives them £200. Then, instead of going back at once, they wander about England collecting more money, and at last in 1716 they meet the Non-jurors. Archibald Campbell and Thomas Brett, who were leading men of that party, now conceived the project of a union with the Orthodox. Peter the Great of Russia (1689-1725) was to be the intermediary. So they draw up a document addressed to the Eastern Patriarchs, in which they describe themselves as the "orthodox and catholic remnant of the British Churches." The chief differences of belief and practice noted in this first document are that the Non-jurors fear to pay too much honour to the Blessed Virgin and Saints, say that the Real Presence is only subjective in the soul of the communicant, and prefer to have no images. They then make two most astonishing propositions, first that the Bishop of Jerusalem shall be the first bishop of Christendom,¹ and secondly, in order to secure uniformity of rites, they want

¹ It is just such a proposition as would naturally be made by Protestants who know a great deal about the Bible, but have no knowledge at all of the history and development of the hierarchy. How utterly opposed their idea is to the whole of Christian antiquity will be seen from Chapter I, pp. 25-27.

to restore everywhere a primitive liturgy, to be specially drawn up. The Bishop of New Rome is to be in every way equal to his brother of Old Rome, and the Church of England (that is themselves) is to be recognized as an independent branch. The whole plan is curiously Protestant and reckless of tradition. Arsenios and Gennadios then take this paper with them to Peter the Great, who sends it on to Constantinople. The Patriarchs answer as might have been expected. Their Church has always kept the Orthodox faith intact and has nothing to modify; they insist on her teaching about the procession of the Holy Ghost, and proceed to instruct the Non-jurors on the other points, as one would instruct catechumens. The idea of making the Patriarch of Jerusalem first bishop is absurd and revolutionary. If the Anglicans like to put themselves under his jurisdiction, of course they may, and he would then appoint bishops for them (this was the last thing the Non-jurors, with their hope of being an equal branch, wanted). As for a primitive liturgy, there is one already, the Byzantine rite, which the Anglicans would do well to adopt. Without Chrism, they say, no one is a perfect Christian, and so on. They do not wonder that Englishmen brought up in the principles of Luther and Calvin should be so mistaken as the Non-jurors are, but they should now be converted to the Orthodox faith; and the Patriarchs end with a tremendous curse against all who deny it. In spite of so great a snub, however, the correspondence dragged on till 1725. Then Archbishop Wake of Canterbury (1716-1737) found out what was going on, and wrote to warn the Patriarchs against these "schismatic presbyters"; "we," he says, "are the true bishops and clergy of the Church of England." That was the end of the negotiations.¹ The abortive Anglican-Lutheran Bishopric at Jerusalem in 1841 (to 1881) of course gave great offence to the Orthodox, and confirmed them in their conviction that there is nothing much to choose between Anglicans and any other Protestants.² In 1840, William Palmer of Magdalen

¹ See for this story G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Non-jurors*; G. B. Howard, *The Schism between the Orthodox and Western Churches*, and the *Echos d'Orient*, viii. pp. 321-328.

² There is another Anglican Bishopric "in" Jerusalem now, of quite a different type, which gives no offence to anyone.

(Oxford) went to Russia in the naïve hope that, as a member of the Church universal, he would be admitted to Orthodox Sacraments. Of course, he was told by every one that he must first join the Orthodox Church, and on May 20, 1841, he received a formal answer from the Metropolitan of Moscow to that effect.¹ He was annoyed to find that every one spoke of an Anglican clergyman as a Pastor,² and confused Anglicans with Lutherans and Calvinists; also the Metropolitan had nothing good to say of the XXXIX Articles.³ At the two Union Conferences held at Bonn in 1874 and 1875 under the auspices of the Old Catholics, Anglicans met Orthodox. Anglican orders and the Filioque were discussed, but they did not arrive at any agreement.⁴

It is during the last twenty years or so that the relations between these two Churches have become very friendly. It is easy to understand their mutual good feeling. Of course the ordinary Greek layman still calls Anglicans Protestants, and the average British tourist in the East is quite content to accept that respectable name. But the extreme High Churchmen represent their Church to the Orthodox authorities as something very different. Their ideal is Catholicism without Popery, which sounds exactly like that of the Eastern Churches. Diomedes Kyriakos tells us that "the Eastern Church rejects both the Roman Church because of her errors and the Protestant Churches because of their opposite errors; she holds a middle place between Catholicism and Protestantism."⁵ As this is just what High Churchmen want, no wonder that they think of union with her. And the Orthodox have reason to be friendly to Anglicans. We have seen how they hate proselytizing, and how they have long been harried by proselytizers, both Catholic and Protestant. The Anglicans arrive sounding a very different note. They protest that the last thing they would dream of doing would be to try to seduce any Orthodox Christian from the venerable and beautiful Church to which he belongs. On

¹ W. Palmer, *Visit to the Russian Church*, p. 415.

² Ibid. p. 44.

³ Ibid. p. 395.

⁴ *Berichte über die Unions-Conferenzen*, Bonn, 1874, 1875.

⁵ Kyriakos, iii. p. 89.

the contrary, their highest ambition is to be somehow recognized by that Church. They very piously attend her offices and liturgy, they are beside themselves with joy if they are allowed to stand inside the Ikonostasis, and they would give anything to receive a Sacrament. Naturally this tone is soothing to Eastern ears. Of course, also, these High Churchmen represent the Church of England as believing everything Orthodox—she has seven Sacraments, believes in the Metusiosis, if not in Transubstantiation, prays to Saints, honours the holy ikons, prays for the dead ; they are generally willing to give up the Filioque.¹ The Easterns know quite well, of course, that all Anglicans do not think like this, but if what the Patriarch of Constantinople a year or two ago called “the Ritualist sect” ever becomes the whole Church of England, then, indeed, in faith there would be little to choose between Anglicans and Orthodox.

Meanwhile a great step has been taken : in September, 1899, the Patriarch (Constantine V), in answering an exceedingly friendly and courteous letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, declared that he desired that a friendly and brotherly

¹ See the Bonn Conferences, 1874, Langdon, p. 12 ; 1875, Howson, p. 42 ; May, p. 66 ; Plunkett, p. 69, &c. See also G. F. Browne, (then) Bishop of Stepney : *The Continuity of the Holy Catholic Church in England* (S.P.C.K. 1897), p. 7 : “I regret that the Church of England was dragged into that addition (the Filioque) by its union with a Church from which we afterwards had to break.” The last attempt to persuade the Orthodox that Anglicans agree with their faith was one whose good faith it would be difficult to defend. In September and October, 1903, Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac (in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America) paid a visit to Russia. He left a document for the consideration of the Russian Holy Synod purporting to describe the faith and practice of his own communion. Of course he does everything possible to make it look Orthodox and he explains away the Articles in the usual Ritualistic manner, quoting St. Thomas Aquinas in support of Art. XXVIII ! As a specimen of the way in which he represents things, he admits that Anglican bishops confirm by the laying on of hands, but he says that priests may also anoint with chrism blessed by a bishop, and “we believe that grace is equally conferred by either way.” One wonders how many members of the Church of England would admit that the grace of Confirmation may be given by a priest with chrism, and how many of their bishops would accept that. The whole document is the extreme example of advanced Ritualism, described without qualification as the belief of “our Church.” How many Anglican bishops would acknowledge it as a fair description of the Church of England ? The text is published in *E. d'Or.*, viii. pp. 143-148.

feeling should prevail between the members of both Churches. He is glad to hear that the Anglicans do not mean to proselytize, although he cannot spare the Archbishop a sharp passage about the Bible societies and their "scandalous pamphlets (σκανδαλώδη βιβλία)." However, he agrees to communicate any important news from his communion to the Archbishop, and also accepts the other proposal that on special feast-days the Orthodox clergy in London and the Anglican clergy in Constantinople should pay their respects to the authorities of the other Church.¹ This brotherly feeling is not, as was carefully explained, inter-communion. Is a real communion between these Churches possible? It is with no prejudice against either that one realizes that, unless the Orthodox fundamentally change their whole system, it is not. The first and greatest objection is that they answer the question: What is the true Church? from their standpoint just as we do from ours. The Orthodox Communion is the whole and only legitimate Church of Christ. To be outside that communion is schism, to disagree with her faith is heresy (p. 365). Of course, any one may join their Church, and they have elaborate forms of reception for converts (p. 366); that would involve accepting all their faith and, at any rate hitherto invariably, their liturgy and rites too. But even Greek inconsistency cannot allow a religious body that holds that position to make an alliance on equal terms of inter-communion with another body. Secondly, they are very undecided about the validity of Anglican orders. On the whole their theologians are more inclined to reject them. They have, indeed, a special reason for doing so in their belief that the grace of Holy Orders dies a natural death in schismatical or heretical bodies (p. 423). At the Old Catholic Conference at Bonn in 1874 the Orthodox members refused to pass the § 9, b.: "We acknowledge that the Church of England and the Churches derived through her have maintained unbroken the Episcopal succession." None of them absolutely denied the thesis, but they said that Anglican orders are doubtful, and appealed to the opinion of Philaret of Moscow (the chief dogmatic theo-

¹ See Gelzer: *Geistl. u. Weltl.*, p. 67, *seq.*, who also notices the curious haughtiness of the Patriarch in his address to the Archbishop.

logian of the 19th century in Russia) as supporting that view.¹ Provost Alexis Maltzew, who is a great authority among the Orthodox on liturgical questions, says that union with the Anglican Church is impossible, because she has neither the Apostolic succession, nor certainty about Dogmas, nor true teaching about the Holy Eucharist, nor valid orders.² On the other hand Professor A. Bulgakoff of Kiev thinks that Anglicans have a succession of orders, but doubts whether heresy has not extinguished its effect.³ In any case, then, the Orthodox would have to make up their minds about this point, too, before there could be any question of corporate union between them and the Anglicans.⁴ But, indeed, the only idea these Easterns can conceive is simply conversion to the Orthodox Church ; and the negotiations from which Anglicans hope so much for the general reunion of Christendom appear to them simply as first steps towards conversion. This is the way they look at the movement : "A few Englishmen, such as the Ritualists, went further and were ready to give up their teaching and principles for the sake of union between the Churches. Such English theologians were present at the Synod of Bonn (1874), in which representatives of the Orthodox, Anglican, and Old

¹ *Bericht* (1874), pp. 35-37. Canon Liddon said that Philaret had told him that his doubts were only derived from Roman theologians (*ibid.* 37). Professor Rhossis of Athens ended by saying that in the Greek Church the question has not yet been decided, but that it is to be hoped that it will soon be so.

² Maltzew : *Oktoichos* (Berlin, 1904), vol. ii. p. xxviii. *seq.*

³ Bulgakoff : *The Question of Anglican Orders* (S.P.C.K., Church Historical Society publication No. LV, 1899), pp. 44, 45.

⁴ Quite lately there has been a case which shows how little they have made up their minds to acknowledge Anglican orders. In October, 1905, a certain Dr. Irvine, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, got into trouble with his own bishop (Bishop Talbot of Central Pennsylvania). He then turned Orthodox, and was of course received by Archbishop Tykhon of Alaska (p. 297), who proceeded to reordain him. But Anglicans need not feel really hurt at this sort of thing ; the Orthodox have reordained Latin priests and bishops too (p. 423) : The case of Dr. Irvine in *E. d'Or.* ix. pp. 124-125. On the other hand, the Deacon Hierotheos Teknopoulos, who was sent by the Patriarch Constantine V to study at Oxford, came back having joined the Church of England, made a great deal of trouble in Cyprus for a year, and eventually went away to England in 1901. He was, of course, excommunicated and degraded by the Orthodox Church *E. d'Or.* iv. pp. 60-62, 243-244).

Catholic Churches assembled in the hope of union. They were prepared to renounce the word *Filioque* as being false ;¹ moreover, they acknowledged Tradition, as also Confession, Penance, the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and even prayer for the dead² . . . (an account of the second Conference in 1875). But most of the theologians of England and America rejected these concessions of the genuine friends (he does not say of what) as being a return to Catholicism, and they held fast to the principles of Protestantism. Only a few Englishmen, such as the theologian Overbeck and his followers, eventually joined the Orthodox Church.”³ So far the view of the chief Greek Church historian. Undoubtedly they would all welcome the conversion of any number of Anglicans to the Orthodox Church ; short of that it is difficult to realize any further possibility. And if it is a question of being converted to anything, it would perhaps, on the whole, be more dignified as well as more natural for Anglicans to be (as a Russian theologian said to Mr. Palmer) “first reconciled to their own Patriarch” the Pope,⁴ than to become yet another (the seventeenth) of the very unequal and very quarrelsome bodies that make up the Orthodox Communion.⁵

¹ This is quite untrue. They all argued about the *Filioque* without end. The Old Catholics did not mind giving it up, but it was the Anglicans who would not do so ; see the *Berichte*, *passim*.

² This, too, is quite a distorted account. The Anglicans would only agree to a sort of compromise on each of these points. Indeed, the only occasions on which the whole Conference agreed were when Döllinger read out some denunciation of Popery.

³ Kyriakos, iii. pp. 104-105. The philologist will be interested to notice in Kyriakos's History that the Greek for *Ritualist* is *τελετόφιλος*. They can form words for anything.

⁴ Palmer, p. 230.

⁵ There is another point that deserves mention. Have the pious and irreproachable English gentlemen who go to the East, and there flatter the Orthodox bishops they meet, any idea what sort of people they are honouring ? If one may believe eye-witnesses like Mr. Brailsford (*Macedonia*, pp. 192-194, 217, &c.), the official *Green Book* just published by the Roumanian Government (*Echos d'Orient*, pp. 109-115), or even the most moderate of the endless Bulgarian accusations (C. Bojan, *Les Bulgares et le patriarche œcuménique*, *passim*), the Greek metropolitans in Macedonia are directly and formally guilty of murder, massacre, and unspeakable atrocities in their campaign against the Bulgars, Vlachs, and non-Hellenic people generally

4. Cyril Lukaris and the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672.

The great event of Orthodox Church history in the 17th century is the affair of Cyril Lukaris († 1638), some time Œcumenical Patriarch. He was a Protestantizer who formed a party of Calvinists in his Church, and his opinions were afterwards condemned by four synods. Constantine Lukaris (Λούκαρις, he took the name of Cyril when he became a monk) was born in Crete in 1572. He studied at Venice and Padua, then went to Alexandria, where he was ordained priest, made archimandrite of a monastery and an officer of the Patriarch's court. Meletios Pegas, the Patriarch (p. 247), sent Lukaris to Poland to comfort the Polish Protestants against Popery, and to see if they could be made Orthodox. It was during this journey that he became very friendly with Lutherans, and especially Calvinists, and began to adopt their ideas; he gradually wandered towards the West and is said to have been at both Wittenberg and Geneva. He also had relations with English Protestants. In 1603 Pegas died and Lukaris was made Patriarch of Alexandria. He now quite openly speaks of his conversion to the ideas of the Reformation: "Since it pleased the merciful God to enlighten me and to show me my errors, I began to seriously consider what I ought to do. And what did I do? For three years, having constantly prayed to the Holy Ghost, I read the books of certain Evangelical Doctors, which I had got by the kindness of my friends, but which our East had never yet seen nor even heard of, because of the bishops' censures; and I compared the teaching of the Reformed Church with that of the Greeks and Latins."¹ He corresponded with many Protestants abroad, among others with George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury (1610-1633), Hugo Grotius,

(*cf. infra*, pp. 275, &c.). "It would be well," says Brailsford, after a hideous account of torture in monasteries (on lunatics), "if the excellent Anglican Churchmen who are trying to promote a union with the Eastern Church would use their influence to reform such abuses as this, instead of perpetuating by their ludicrous flatteries the complacency which explains them" (*Macedonia*, p. 68).

¹ Letter to Mark Anthony de Dominis, quoted by Ph. Meyer, *Lukaris*, in the *Realenzyklopädie* (1902), xi. p. 686.

De Dominis, &c. He was already known abroad as "a friend of the Reformed Church."¹ His idea seems to have been, not to join any form of Protestantism already set up, but to bring about a reformation of the Orthodox Church, just as the Western Protestants had reformed the Catholic Church. In 1620 he was made Patriarch of Constantinople. His reign there is one of the very worst examples of the way in which the Porte deposes and reappoints patriarchs. He was Cyril I of Constantinople, was deposed and then reappointed no less than four times, so that there are five separate periods during which he was Patriarch, with other bishops in between (1620-1623, 1623-1630, 1630-1634, 1634-1635, 1637-1638 : in 1630 one, and in 1634 two other patriarchs had a few months between). In 1628 Lukaris, still very friendly with Abbot of Canterbury, sent as a present to King Charles I of England what is now one of the chief treasures of the British Museum, the Codex Alexandrinus.² While he was intermittently Patriarch the Catholic missions in the East were very flourishing, the Jesuits had great influence, protected by the French Ambassador, while Venice held Crete and other islands.³ At that time, then, great efforts were being made to convert the Orthodox to the Catholic Church, and there was a considerable Latinizing party among them. Of these Latinizers, of the Jesuits and France, Lukaris was the uncompromising enemy. His friends were the ambassadors of the two chief Protestant Powers,⁴ England and Holland. In 1628 Anton Leger arrived as preacher at the Hollandish Embassy, and then he and Lukaris spoilt everything by trying

Greek Bible of an openly Protestant type, which was made and printed at Geneva. All the same, Lukaris as Patriarch had to canonize a Saint—St. Gerasimos the New († 1579). One wonders how he felt while he was doing it.

At last, in 1629, Lukaris published his famous Confession.¹ This Confession is quite frankly Protestant and Calvinistic :—The Bible has more authority than the Church, God has absolutely predestined the Elect and rejected the Reprobate without any regard to their merits, Christ alone intercedes for us, the Church is the congregation of the faithful of Christ throughout the world, and only the Elect really belong to it, the Church can err, men are justified by faith alone, there is no free will, all the works of the unregenerate are sins, there are only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, in which Christ is present by the spiritual apprehension of faith, without faith there is no Presence ; there is no middle state between Heaven and Hell.² Lukaris had now quite formed a Protestantizing party to oppose the Latinizers. But in 1638 his enemies persuaded the Sultan (Murad IV, 1623–1640) that he was stirring up rebellion among the Cossacks. He had already been deposed so often that this time Murad meant to make an end of him altogether. So he sent some Janissaries to throttle him and throw his body into the sea.³ His friends found it washed down far from Constantinople and gave him Orthodox burial with the repeated prayers for his soul that he would himself have abhorred when alive. But his party did not die with him. Meletios Pantogallos,

Metropolitan of Ephesus, Sophronios of Athens, and Neophytos III of Constantinople (1636-1637), were his chief pupils. The Orthodox, however, in the enormous majority were true to the faith of their fathers, and in the years following the murder of poor Lukaris they held four synods, at Constantinople (1639), Iasion (Yassy in Moldavia, 1643), Jerusalem (1672), and again at Constantinople (1672), in which they drew up most uncompromising professions of the real Orthodox faith, and condemned and anathematized Lukaris's Confession and all his followers. It was Lukaris's successor, Cyril II (three times Patriarch, 1634, 1635-1636, 1638-1639), who held the Synod of Constantinople in 1639, his successor, Parthenios II (1644-1645, 1648-1651), that of Yassy, and Dionysios IV¹ the other Synod of Constantinople (1672). It was also as a refutation of Lukaris's heresies that Peter Mogilas of Kiev (p. 364) and Dositheos of Jerusalem (1661-1669, p. 364)² drew up their Confessions.

The *Synod of Jerusalem* was by far the most important of all, and its Acts are the last official pronouncement of the Orthodox Church. Dositheos was Patriarch of Jerusalem from 1669 to 1707. At the consecration of a church at Bethlehem in 1672 he announced his intention of summoning a synod;³ it met in the same year at Jerusalem. About seventy members attended, among others, Nektarios, ex-Patriarch of

the chief feature is that they absolutely deny that Lukaris wrote the Confession, quote sentences which they say various people had heard him speak in his sermons, and which are Orthodox on the points on which the Confession is Protestant, and anathematize any one who shall ever say that he was its author.¹ The Acts of the synod were published under the heading: "Christ guides. A Shield of the Orthodox Faith, or an Apology and confutation against those who slanderously say that the Eastern Church thinks heretically concerning God and Divine things, as the Calvinists falsely state, drawn up by the synod held at Jerusalem under Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem."² As an appendix to the Acts follows a long "Confession of Dositheos." The *Acts of Jerusalem* and *Dositheos's Confession* are printed by the Orthodox in all their collections of Symbols, and are considered one of the most important as well as the last of the official pronouncements of their Church. And in all the proceedings of this synod there is not a single word against the Azymite Creed-tampering Latins. They were so busy with these new enemies, the Calvinists, that they quite forgot us. As this is the only occasion in history on which Greek bishops met without letting us know what they think of us, the fact deserves to be noted. After the Synod of Jerusalem one hears no more of Protestantism within the Orthodox Church.

Summary.

There was, then, a certain amount of theological activity among the Orthodox after the fall of Constantinople, although it chiefly took the

in the 18th. Meanwhile the German Protestants had made overtures to the Orthodox which came to nothing. The correspondence between the Patriarch Jeremias II and the Tübingen theologians is the most famous case. The English Non-jurors made equally futile proposals. But of late years especially the Orthodox authorities have been very friendly towards Anglicans, who alone do not try to proselytize in the East. On the other hand, the belief that they are the whole Church held by the Easterns seems to make any hope of corporate reunion between them and Anglicans impossible. Cyril Lukaris of Alexandria and Constantinople caused the greatest trouble during this period. He was a Protestantizer who wrote a purely Calvinist Confession. After the Sultan had killed him four councils, of which the most important was that at Jerusalem in 1672 under Dositheos, condemned his heresies.

The first element of Balkan discontent is the mutual hatred of Greek and Slav. It is now far more active than their old enmity against the Turk. Indeed, both sides are always appealing to the Turk against each other.¹ A further complication is that Bulgars, Serbs, and Roumans hate each other only less than they all hate Greeks. It would be a fundamental mistake to confuse these races with the States set up during the last century. When they rose against the Turks, the Great Powers felt they must give them some result for their fighting: on the other hand, if they had all been made free there would have been no Turkey left. So bits were cut off where these populations were supposed to be thickest and made into the kingdoms of Greece, Servia, Roumania, and the principedom of Bulgaria. The people of Montenegro, who have always been free, are Serbs. But these four races went on as before, scattered all over the Balkans and overflowing into Hungary. A Serb of Turkey, for instance, is just as much a Serb as his brother in the kingdom of Servia. So in Turkey, in Macedonia especially, these four nations all live together in great confusion, while the Turkish regiments march up and down, keeping order by plundering and murdering all impartially.

All their bad feelings are reflected in the affairs of their Church.²

¹ Quite lately, since the Bulgars have become the strongest element in Macedonia, the situation has become that of an alliance between Turks and Greeks against them. The war of 1897 is forgotten, the Sultan showers his decorations on Greek statesmen, and during the Macedonian insurrection of 1903, officers from Free Greece were not ashamed to offer their swords to the Turk (with the full consent of their Government) against the Bulgars. Pending the day when it shall all become Greek they would rather see Macedonia under the Turk than free and Bulgarian.

² The accounts of the way in which the Patriarchist (Greek) metropolitans in Macedonia carry on their campaign against the other races sound like the most lurid stories of a frankly savage age. Mr. Brailsford tells of a bishop who hired assassins to murder a wounded Bulgarian chief and then kept a photograph of the blood-dripping head as a pleasant souvenir (p. 193), who is believed to have been responsible for a massacre of sixty Bulgars on April 6, 1905 (p. 217). They convert Bulgars by threats of massacre (p. 215) and by denouncing them to the Turks (p. 211). Another bishop refused to admit any wounded Bulgars to his hospital for the simple reason: "They are our enemies" (pp. 199-200). "They can all come in," said he, "if they will only acknowledge the Patriarch" (p. 201).

They are all Orthodox ; and for centuries the Greeks have thought that the government of the Orthodox Church is their business. Its head is, or was, the Œcumenical Patriarch, always a Greek, and its ruling caste is the Phanar. Until the wars of independence began the Patriarch got to be as near a Pope as any one ever has. And the Phanariote Greeks kept all the perquisites of the Church for themselves ; the poor village priests might be Serbs or Bulgars or Roumans, they were married, and so in any case they could never rise to any higher place, but all the metropolitans were Greeks, sent out from Constantinople. And whatever the people might speak, the Holy Liturgy was sung in Greek. So for centuries there was sullen discontent among the non-Greek people and lower clergy against these Phanariote bishops. This was not only the case among the Slavs ; the Arabic-speaking Orthodox in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine had just the same complaint.

Another feature that is rather astonishing is that the Rayahs began more and more to confuse the Phanar with the hated Turkish rule. We have seen that the Patriarch was the acknowledged civil Head of all the Orthodox before the Porte. It is also true that these rich Phanariote Greeks were always very ready to be the instruments of Turkish oppression over their fellow-Christians. The Vaivodes of Roumania, horrible tyrants sent by the Sultan to misrule the Roumans, were all Phanariote Greeks.¹ So the other Rayahs saw in the Phanar simply the shadow of the Turk and hated the Greeks even more than their real masters, since they were traitors to the cause. When Alexander Hyspanti in 1821 made his fatuous attempt to raise the Greek flag in Moldavia and issued proclamations about the sacred cause of Hellas to those Roumans, he was surprised that none of them would help him. Naturally they would not fight for another V^oivode.² The result of this feeling is that as soon

¹ De la Jonquière, *Hist. des Ottomans*, pp. 364-368. "The Greeks of the Phanar, lowest and most corrupt servants of the Porte. It would be impossible to find greater abjectness united to greater vanity." The Vaivodes made huge fortunes and invented absurd princely titles for themselves, but they were *flogged* by the Turk if he was not pleased with them.

² W. A. Phillips, *The War of Greek Independence*, chap. iii. p. 30, *seq.*

as ever a Balkan State gets independent of the Sultan it makes its Church independent of the Patriarch ; they will not let their metropolitans any longer obey the authority at Constantinople, which seems to them to be all too closely allied to their enemy the Porte. So it has become a regular principle that wherever there is a free State, there shall there be a free and independent national Church. It is again the old Byzantine idea of making the Church follow the vagaries of civil politics, that we saw to be the root of the claims of the See of Constantinople, and indeed the original root of the great schism. Only the idea is turned against the very see that had grown and flourished on it. And that see finds the national and political idea much less sympathetic now that she stands to lose by it. The principle of the independent Church in the independent State finds no favour in the Phanar. The Patriarchs worked so hard and grovelled so low in the old days for the sake of getting a big Patriarchate, naturally they do not like losing it piece by piece, as they have done throughout the 19th century. The process is nearly always the same. As soon as the first National Assembly, or House of Deputies, or whatever it may be, of the new State meets, it passes a law that the national Orthodox Church of the land acknowledges no Head but Christ ; it then forms a Holy Synod on the Russian model, giving all possible authority over the Church to the civil government ("no Head but Christ" always means this), and lastly sends a note to the Patriarch to inform him that he has ceased to reign in the land in question. Of course the Patriarch is furious, generally begins by excommunicating the new schismatics in a mass, but eventually has to accept things (Russia makes him do so as a rule), and, swallowing his pride, he receives the Holy Synod as his "Sister in Christ." Only in the quite specially bitter case of the Bulgarian Church has he hitherto refused, and the Bulgars are still excommunicate. But here, too, he will have to give in at last.

Naturally the Phanar hates the national idea ; in 1872 it held a synod to declare that *Philetism*¹ (the love of one's race in ecclesiastical matters) is the latest and most poisonous heresy. But it is a most astonishing case of poetic justice. It was on

¹ *φίλος* and *ετης*.

the strength of this very national idea that centuries ago the Patriarch waxed strong and rebelled against his over-lord, the Pope. Now he sees his own children, having learned it from him, also wax strong on it and rebel against him. And so he finds Philetism to be a deadly heresy. Poor Patriarch ! in his glory he was only a very feeble imitation of the Pope, and now he is fixed between two theories, and either way he loses. Shall he denounce Philetism, stand out for the old rights of the hierarchy and of the chief sees, preach unity and ancient councils ? Alas ! his see is not even an Apostolic one ; he would have to go down below Alexandria and Antioch. Every one knows which is the first see in Christendom, and every one knows that unity means returning to the obedience of that see. Or shall he, taking up a cry that seems to come more naturally from Constantinople, talk of equality and national Churches, national rights and no aggression, no Head, in short, but Christ ? But, then, what shall he say to the Bulgars ? Of course what he wants is just enough national idea to disobey the Pope and not enough for the Bulgars to disobey him. And so the irony of development has landed him in that most hopeless of positions, a *via media* between two consistent and mutually exclusive systems.

But we have not yet exhausted the list of his troubles. Servia and Roumania have national Churches, covering just these two new kingdoms. But throughout the poor remnant of the Patriarchate there are Serbs and Roumans too. And the Phanar, which never repents and never learns, goes on sending Greek metropolitans to rule over these people. So they, too, are violently discontent, clamour for bishops of their own race, and for the liturgy in their own language, and openly ask to join the independent Churches of their free brothers. So even after he has lost so much of his "broad lands" the Patriarch has no peace with what is left.

His most dangerous enemy of all, however, is the Russian Holy Synod. What the Russian Government wants is quite simple—unity within, expansion without. And in this matter, as in all, the Holy Synod that rules the Church of Russia is the willing tool of the Government. So in Church matters Russian policy works out as being uniformity within, and

the Orthodox Church in its Russian branch, with the Russian Liturgy and the rule of the Russian Holy Synod, without. We shall come back to the way in which uniformity in Russia is procured, the abominable persecution of the Ruthenian Church, the crushing out of the Georgian Church, the harrying of the Armenians. As for the preaching of the Orthodox faith in other lands, one has only to look for the places where the Russian Government wants a sphere of influence, there is the Orthodox Russian faith preached. Russia, for instance, has great interests in Persia. A port on the Persian Gulf would suit her admirably ; she would like to, and if the other Powers let her, probably will, some day swallow Persia whole. Meanwhile, Persia is getting more and more under her sphere of influence ; she has the railway, and the Persian Christians (Nestorians) are being persuaded to join the Russian Church. She has interests in Syria and Palestine. A belt of Russian territory stretching from the Caucasus by Tiflis to the Mediterranean by Jaffa would be the very thing. It would cut the Mohammedan world in two, greatly hasten the day on which the Russian eagle is to fly over Constantinople, and it would secure Jerusalem, the Holy City of all Christendom, for the Czar. So the Russian Church is infinitely active in Syria and the Holy Land. She has two objects—to convert all Christians there to the Orthodox faith, and to make that faith synonymous with the Russian national Church. It is by this second object that she falls foul of the Œcumenical Patriarch. The halcyon days when the two Patriarchates (Antioch and Jerusalem) and the metropolitan sees, abbacies, and good places generally were perquisites kept for Phanariote Greeks, are over. Here, as everywhere, Russia takes up the cause of the native population against the Phanar, and the Phanar, which ignored the complaints of the wretched Syrians, cannot ignore Russia. So Russia has an anti-Greek candidate for all these places now, and her candidate gets them.

That is not all. Orthodox Syria and Palestine are already almost Russian colonies. There is a Russian Imperial Palestine Society under the Czar's special protection, that commands enormous resources and that spends them to cover the land

with Russian institutions. There are sixty-four Russian schools scattered all over Syria and Palestine where native children are taught the Orthodox faith and the fear of God and the Czar.¹ The Russian Palestine Society is founding preparatory schools for priests, who are then to be sent to finish their studies at Russian universities. It has built great establishments where a hospital, home for pilgrims, Russian Consulate, &c., cluster around a church in which the Russian services are held. At Jerusalem the enormous Russian buildings on the road to Jaffa dominate the city, besides the great Russian Gethsemani Church and five other establishments belonging to the same society ; at Ain-Kerim, Hebron, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Ramleh, Jericho, &c., the high towers of the Russian buildings stand up above every other building as if they were already the houses of Russian colonial governors.² Then come the Balkan States. Here, too, Russia prepares the day when she can swallow them by teaching them to look to the Czar as their natural protector. She always takes up the cause of the Slavs against the Phanar, she made the Sultan constitute the Bulgarian Church, and, in spite of the schism, the Russian Church remains in communion with it. And Mount Athos, the holy mountain and centre of Orthodox monastic life, is getting swamped with Russians. In fact, Russians say quite openly now that their Holy Synod had better take over the government of the whole Orthodox communion ; nine-tenths of that communion are Russians, the Œcumenical Patriarch may doubtless keep a shadowy primacy of rank, but practically Orthodoxy is, and should be, Russian.³ Of course, all this is gall and wormwood to the Phanar ; the Patriarch always makes quite hopeless attempts to persuade the Porte not to accept pro-Russian candidates for the other sees, and quite recently he ventured on a protest against the doings of the Russian Palestine Society, addressed to the Holy Synod

¹ *Echos d'Orient*, iii. pp. 177-181 : *Les écoles russes de Palestine et de Syrie*. In the seminaries all the Arab ecclesiastical students are carefully taught the Russian language. *E. d'Or.* vii. p. 117.

² *Echos d'Orient*, iv. pp. 202, seq., 275, seq. : *La politique russe dans la Palestine et la Syrie*.

³ So the Metropolitan of Moscow in 1899 : *Echos d'Orient*, ii. 246 (April, 1899).

at Petersburg. He was told in answer that that society had as patron no less a person than His Imperial Majesty the Czar ; had His Holiness the Patriarch realized this fact when he made his complaint ? His Holiness would do well to look after his own diocese.¹

Another point to be mentioned is one that affects Catholics. It is the influence of Austria-Hungary. The Emperor of Austria is throughout the Balkans looked upon as the protector of the Catholics, and the Catholic cause is identified with that of Austria—or rather of Hungary, for it is as King of Hungary that Francis Joseph II is chiefly concerned. This fact is a disastrous one for us. For a long time two great lords overshadowed these lands, the Czar as protector of the Orthodox, and the Emperor-King as chief of the Catholics. The issue is no longer quite so simple. Formerly all Slavs looked to Russia. They all dream of a great Slav Empire, for in no man's breast does the sacred fire of national feeling burn with so clear a flame as in that of a Slav. They used to look to incorporation with Russia as the realization of that dream. But the myth of the Czar-liberator is pretty well exploded now. It flourished luxuriantly till he began to liberate ; now he is such a perfect terror to those he has set free (the Georgians and Armenians, for instance) that they look back to the gentle Turk with tears of affectionate regret. And the Catholic Slavs (Czechs, Croats, &c.) always have the wholesome example of Poland before their eyes. The hope of all of them is now rather a union of independent Slav States in the closest alliance. But the great obstacle to all such dreams of Panslavism is the Dual Monarchy ; and so the Balkan Slavs hate and dread this great neighbour. Not far off across the Save are the Croats who sit under the crown of St. Stephen ; absolutely the only difference between a Croat and a Serb is, that the Croat is Catholic and uses the Latin alphabet, the Serb is Orthodox and writes exactly the same language in Cyrillic letters. And no two races ever yet hated each other as the Serbs and Croats do. So to ask a Serb to become a Catholic is like asking him to turn Croat, look to Austria-Hungary for protection, and give up the

¹ *Echos d'Orient*, iv. p. 205.

Panslavist hope. That is why these ridiculous little Balkan States are so angry with Catholic missionaries, why they sometimes become active persecutors, and why one hears such absurd statements as that the question of the Catholic schools is one of "life or death for Bulgaria." The life or death of these Balkan States depends, not on the Catholic nuns who teach in these schools, but on Russia. Really, of course, the comparison between Russia and Austria that these people make (Orthodox = Russia, Catholic = Austria) is quite absurd. On the one hand, the cause of Russia is that of Orthodoxy now. Every Russian is, or should be, Orthodox.¹ All the Orthodox will apparently soon be Russian, the Orthodox missionaries are all Russians paid and sent by the Holy Synod, that is practically a department of the government of Petersburg. There is nothing like this in the case of Austria. The Catholic Church is no more committed to the Dual Monarchy than to any other State, and Austria is not in the least committed to the Catholic cause. It is a tolerant and civilized State in which people of any religion, Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox or Mohammedans, live in entire freedom and content. Doubtless Austria-Hungary has interests in the Balkans,² but it does not make a ray of difference to the statesmen at Vienna whether the Balkan peoples are Catholic or Orthodox or Mohammedan. So the Catholic missions have nothing to do with Austria and do not receive any help from Vienna. The missionaries are chiefly Frenchmen or Italians sent out by the Roman Propaganda. From every point of view a comparison between Russia and Austria is absurd. Russia means a barbarous and intolerant tyranny, and no sane man would be at the mercy of its Government if he could possibly help it. Austria is a constitutional country of which the citizens

¹ Of course, there are the Raskolniks, &c., but the point is that Russia's idea is one vast Russian Orthodox Church and nothing else.

² If Austria were to annex or occupy Albania, Macedonia, and Thrace, the various nations that devour these lands with their quarrels would, at any rate, have the advantage of a tolerant and civilized Government which would protect all their religions and languages equally while preventing them from persecuting one another. It is difficult to conceive any other solution of the eternal Nearer Eastern question that would answer so well. Bosnia and Hercegovina show that even the Turk is enormously better off under Austria than under the Sultan.

enjoy as much liberty as those of any land anywhere. The story of the Poles and of the Ruthenian Church shows how Russia treats Catholics. In Austria, on the other hand, the Orthodox enjoy every advantage they could possibly wish for ; the Government pays their bishops, subsidizes their schools, and has made a Concordat with the Œcumenical Patriarch for their advantage. However, the inveterate habit the Balkan Slavs have of confusing Catholicism with Austria-Hungary is the great hindrance to Catholic missions there.

One of the most interesting questions concerning a religious body is that of its size. Statistics in this case are specially difficult, because the Turk has no idea of such things, and the Russian persecution of dissenters makes it impossible to know how the figures would show if the people were free to profess what faith they like. I find the total number of Orthodox Christians reckoned at from ninety-five to one hundred millions,¹ of which between four-fifths and nine-tenths belong to the Russian Church. Something must now be said about each of the sixteen branches.

Ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία (*the Great Church*) is the official name for the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which still takes precedence of all the others. What is now left of this patriarchate after all the national Churches have been cut off from it, covers as much of the present Turkish Empire as is not occupied by the other patriarchates or Cyprus, that is to say, Turkey in Europe and Asia Minor ; although even in this greatly reduced territory wherever there are Bulgars the Patriarch's jurisdiction is disputed by their Exarch. As we shall see, in the Great Church the title "Metropolitan" has become the common one for bishops, even when they have no suffragans. The Œcumenical Patriarch rules over seventy-four metropolitans and twenty other bishops.² Canonically he has no jurisdiction outside of his own

¹ Hickmann (*Karte der Verbreitungsgebiete der Religionen*, Vienna, Freytag u. Berndt) : ninety-five millions ; Kattenbusch (*Orient. Kirche*, o.c. p. 445) : "Something over one hundred millions."

² The Metropolitans of Ephesus, Heraclea, Thessalonica, Crete, and Smyrna divide these twenty bishops among their provinces. The other metropolitans have no suffragans. For the list of sees and their revenues, see Silbernagl : *Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, p. 35.

patriarchate. On the other hand, he is still the official *civil* head of the whole Roman nation in the Turkish Empire, and the other Orthodox Patriarchs (of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem), as well as the bishops of Cyprus, belong to that nation. So the Œcumenical Patriarch has a sort of civil authority over them; for instance, they can only approach the Porte through him. The Phanar has constantly tried to change that vague civil authority into real ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for a long time it succeeded. From the Turkish conquest till the beginning of the 19th century the other patriarchs were very poor and helpless, and during that time the Patriarch of Constantinople reached the height of his ambition, and became something very like a Pope. He especially claimed the right of confirming the election of the others, and no one was strong enough to resist his claim. Now, however, that Russia is taking up every one's cause against the Phanar, these other patriarchs are able to assert their complete independence of every one save Christ and the seven general councils. The last attempt to judge of an election was made by Germanos IV of Constantinople (1842-1845 and 1852-1853), in the case of Jerusalem in 1843. But the bishops of Jerusalem indignantly denied his right to interfere, and as Russia was on their side Germanos had to give in, after the quarrel had lasted two years.¹ No such claim has been advanced since,² although the Phanar still tries to assert a kind of shadowy jurisdiction by keeping a permanent legate at the other Patriarchs' Courts. For the present it has succeeded at Antioch and Jerusalem, but has failed at Alexandria, where a very energetic and strongly anti-Phanariote Patriarch under the English rule can afford to defy it (p. 286 n. 3). A similar case is that of the trouble about Sinai in 1866 (p. 310).

The only remnant of jurisdiction beyond his patriarchate still left to the honorary chief of the Orthodox Church is the much-disputed right of consecrating the holy chrism. Undoubtedly, in the East originally, as in the West always, the holy chrism was consecrated by the bishop who would use it. Then, apparently only because the chrism in the East is a very

¹ Silbernagl, p. 24.

² However, something similar is going on at Cyprus at this moment.

difficult and expensive thing to prepare, the custom grew up of making and consecrating large quantities at Constantinople, and sending portions to all the other bishops. Since about the 13th or 14th century the Patriarchs of Constantinople have claimed this as an absolute right. They alone can lawfully consecrate chrism. All other Churches, whether otherwise independent or not, must receive it from them. However, lately especially, this claim, too, has been hotly disputed. Russia consecrates her own chrism since the 17th century; Roumania has begun to do so, too, after a fierce quarrel. I believe that all the other Orthodox Churches still receive theirs from Constantinople, though not always very willingly.¹ We shall come back to the Œcumenical Patriarch and his Court in the next chapter (p. 338).

2. The Patriarchate of Alexandria.

The next Church in rank is that of Egypt. As the great majority of Egyptian Christians are Copts, and so out of communion with the Orthodox Church, the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria has only a small flock, about thirty-seven thousand souls. In the first part of this book it is said that the Orthodox of Egypt and Syria were called Melkites (p. 14). It should now be noted that that name is at present generally used for the Uniates in communion with Rome. So it is better in modern times to speak only of the "Orthodox" of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. The Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria claims, of course, to be St. Mark's successor, just as does his Coptic rival. In the 17th and 18th centuries he lived at Cairo; now he has returned to Alexandria. Since 1672 the sees of this patriarchate have been reduced to four; their bishops are all called metropolitans, although they have no suffragans, and they do not reside in their titular dioceses (Ethiopia, Cairo, Damietta, and Reshid), but form the Patriarch's Curia.²

Quite lately there has been trouble in this Church, as in the other patriarchates. Photios was one of the most determined

¹ Cf. *Echos d'Or*. iii. pp. 1-7: *Du pouvoir de consacrer le saint Chrême*.

² Silbernagl, *o.c.* pp. 24, 36.

opponents of Russia in Syria. After having been Patriarch of Jerusalem for a short time, he was elected to Alexandria when the late Patriarch Sophronios died in 1899. It is said that the Russians sent him there to get rid of him.¹ He took possession of his see in September, 1900. But the Phanar would not have him there, and persuaded the Sultan not to give him the Berat, without which he could not reign. At last, in September, 1900, he got his Berat and took possession of his see. At once he was met by the complaints of the Orthodox Arabs, who would like a Patriarch of their own race. For a time the Œcumenical Patriarch, Constantine V, still refused to acknowledge him.² But since then Constantine has been deposed, and Joachim III restored at Constantinople. I believe that Joachim recognizes him, and that things have now quieted down. It is said that His Beatitude speaks Arabic quite well, and is conciliating his discontented subjects.³

3. The Patriarchate of Antioch.

The Orthodox Church of Antioch is now only a shadow of what the great "third see" was in the days before Ephesus. The Nestorian and Jacobite Churches are formed at her expense; she has lost Palestine and Cyprus; the Byzantine Patriarchate has filched all Asia Minor from her, and there are a large number of

¹ *Echos d'Orient*, iii. p. 185.

² That was still the case when the last edition of Silbernagl was published, p. 25. See the *Echos d'Orient*, iv. p. 183, *seq.*

³ However, the troubles are not over yet. Lord Photios has just categorically refused to allow a legate of the Œcumenical Patriarch to reside at his court, and the Phanar still counts him as an enemy. A weak point in his position has been this: he has only three metropolitans. Now the Canons require, for the election of a bishop, a synod of at least three members besides the patriarch. As soon, then, as a metropolitan dies, Lord Photios only has two left, and cannot canonically elect a new one. So he has to send to Constantinople to ask the synod there to elect for him. Since the whole of his policy, as that of the other patriarchs, is to shake off any pretence of authority still claimed by the Phanar, this obviously very much weakens his position. The latest news from Alexandria is that His Holiness is about to reorganize the Church of St. Mark, so as to do away with this inconvenience. Of course, he has only to found two or three more titular sees.

Uniates in these parts.¹ So the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, like his brother at Alexandria, lives rather on memories of his past splendour than on any practical importance. He rules over twelve metropolitans²—all that are left of the hundred and fifty sees that once obeyed his predecessors—and about two hundred and fifty thousand Orthodox subjects,³ nearly all Syrian Arabs, who know no Greek. He also has two or three titular metropolitans to form his court. He now lives at Damascus. There has been trouble at Antioch, too, lately.⁴ Since 1724 all the Orthodox Patriarchs have been Phanariote Greeks, who could not, as a rule, even speak Arabic. However, at last the Arab-speaking people, who were always discontented with that arrangement, got their chance. In 1899, the see being vacant, they elected Meletios, Metropolitan of Laodicea, to be Patriarch, and the Russian Palestine Society warmly took up his cause. Meletios was an Arab, so the Phanar would not have him. Of course, as always, the only question was, what the Sultan would decide. The Phanar, backed by the French Ambassador, implored the Sultan not to give him his Berat ; the Russian Ambassador insisted on his having it. For a whole year the Sultan wavered, the see was vacant, and Meletios hoped and doubted. Then, of course, Russia won ; the Berat arrived in 1900, and Meletios became Patriarch. But the Phanar, the Greeks of Jerusalem, and the Greek Church still obstinately refused to recognize him. On the other hand, the Russian and Roumanian Churches were on his side. He was pointedly left out in the last Encyclical from Constantinople (p. 345, n. 3), and all the Greek papers spoke of him as a schismatical intruder, and persecutor of the Greek clergy in his patriarchate. On February 8, 1906, Lord Meletios died at his residence at Damascus. In June,

¹ There are no less than seven Churches, each of which represents a fraction of the old Antiochene Church (*E. d'Or.* iii. p. 223, *seq.*)

² Aleppo, Amida, Arcadia, Beirut, Emesus, Epiphania, Laodicea (in Syria), Seleucia, Tarsus, Theodosiupolis (Erzerum), Tripolis, Tyre - and - Sidon. Cf. *Echos d'Orient*, iii. p. 143 ; Silbernagl, pp. 25, 36.

³ So the *Echos d'Orient*, l.c. Silbernagl reckons 28,836 families; Kyriakos, 200,000 souls.

⁴ For the endless internal schisms and quarrels that have rended this see since the 15th century, see Kyriakos, iii. pp. 56-59.

Gregory Hadad, Metropolitan of Tripoli, also an Arab, was elected as his successor, and the schism still continues.¹

4. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem.

The See of St. James, the "brother of God" (τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου), has always been the smallest and the poorest of the patriarchates. Its jurisdiction stretches over Palestine from Ptolemais down to the peninsular of Sinai, of which the extreme point is occupied by the autocephalous monastery. Thirteen metropolitans and about fifteen thousand people obey the Orthodox Patriarch.² He lives by the Orthodox monastery of the Holy Sepulchre (the Anastasis). The modern history of this Church, too, consists chiefly of a series of quarrels and schisms. Since the 16th century all the Patriarchs have been Greeks, whereas the Orthodox people are, of course, Syrian Arabs. When the Synod of Constantinople against the Bulgars was held in 1872 (p. 319), Cyril II of Jerusalem, although he was then in the city, refused to take part in it, or to have any share in the proceedings against the Bulgarian Church. His motive was obvious. The Russians from the beginning had warmly taken up the Bulgarian cause; they were all-powerful in Palestine—indeed, the only protectors of the Orthodox Church there—and Cyril did not dare offend his patrons. But his absence from the synod made all the difference. It prevented the excommunication pronounced against the Bulgars from being the unanimous verdict of all the Orthodox Patriarchs, so the Phanar was very angry with him, and had him deposed, setting up Prokopios in his stead. Cyril was a Greek, but he had taken the anti-Phanariote ("national Church," or Philetist) side, and Russia was his friend. So Russia and the Palestine Syrians were on his side, still considered him Patriarch, and still kept

¹ For the whole story, see *E. d'Or.* iii. p. 183, *seq.*, iv. p. 186, v. p. 247, *seq.*, ix. pp. 123, 176–183. It was said that Meletios sent to Petersburg for the holy chrism (*l.c.* iv. p. 186).

² The dioceses are: Cæsarea (Pal.), Bethsan (Skythopolis), Petra, Acre, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Lydda, Gaza, Jaffa, Nablus, Samaria, Tabor, Philadelphia. Silbernagl, p. 37.

his name in the Holy Liturgy. On the other hand, the Phanar, the other Patriarchs, and nearly all the rest of the Orthodox world, acknowledged Prokopios. At last the Russians forced Prokopios to resign (1875); Cyril died, and Hierotheos was elected Patriarch. But he, to every one's surprise, sided with the Phanar against the Bulgars. The Russian Government then fell foul of him, too, and seized the opportunity to carry out a plan it had long contemplated. The Holy Sepulchre possessed some property in Bessarabia (in Russian territory). The Government now said it would relieve the Patriarch of all anxiety concerning this distant property, and administer it for him. How it did so may be imagined. It promptly proceeded to pay itself one-fifth for its trouble, confiscated two-fifths for what it described as "pious purposes" in Russia, and sent only two-fifths of the income to Jerusalem. All the Greek world is still helplessly furious at this robbery. Hierotheos died in 1882. There were then three candidates for the vacant see—Nikodemos, Gerasimos, and Photios, who is always a determined opponent of Russia, and who, as we have already seen, is now Patriarch of Alexandria. Photios was elected quite canonically, but the Russians made the Sultan refuse him the *Berat*, and give it to Nikodemos instead. Gerasimos became Patriarch of Antioch in 1885. Photios had to go to be a monk again at Sinai.¹ But he did not rest there in peace; the Phanar was for him at that time, and by 1890 they had persuaded the Sultan to change his mind and to depose Nikodemos. Photios arrives at Jerusalem with the Sultan's *Irade*, and Nikodemos is made, as usual, to sign a document declaring that he is too old to reign any longer, and that he wishes to go back to his monastery. He is still there at St. George's Laura at Halki, a very pious and kind old gentleman, though he has been heard to whisper to visitors that the Orthodox Church would get on all right were it not for Lord Photios.² But the Russians said that whatever happened, they would not have Photios at Jerusalem. So the third of the original candidates, Gerasimos, was per-

¹ We shall see that practically all bishops and candidates for bishoprics throughout the Orthodox Church are monks (p. 351).

² *Ech. d'Or.* iii. 185.

suaded to resign the more honoured See of Antioch and to become Patriarch of Jerusalem. Photios became Metropolitan of Nazareth. But that city, too, is a great Russian centre, and he was still a thorn in their side, till, in 1899, the old Patriarch of Alexandria, Sophronios, died. We have seen how the Russians then got rid of Photios by helping his candidature to that see, where they have, as long as the English rule there, no interests, and how he has since become an enemy of the Phanar. In 1897 Lord Gerasimos of Jerusalem died, and again there was a great struggle between the Russian and Greek parties. The leader of the Russian side is Euthymios, Archimandrite of the monastery of the Anastasis. This is the person who was responsible for the outrage against the Latin Franciscans in November, 1901. However, the Greek candidate, Damianos, Metropolitan of Philadelphia, was elected, and he is now Patriarch. Lord Damianos has been staying for a long time at Constantinople in the charitable hope of helping to settle some of the disputes that rend the Orthodox Church, the quarrel against Gregory of Antioch, the trouble in Cyprus, and, above all, the great Bulgarian schism. His Holiness has now returned to his see.¹ The quarrel about Mount Sinai (p. 310) also concerns the Church of Jerusalem.

5. The Church of Cyprus.

We have seen that the Cypriote bishops, on the strength of their succession from St. Barnabas, persuaded the Council of Ephesus to recognize their Church as independent of the See of Antioch (p. 47.) Since then this little Church has had many adventures; it was persecuted by the Crusaders and Venice;² and after the Turkish conquest the Cypriote

¹ For all this story see Kyriakos, iii. pp. 62-65, and, for the latest developments, the *Ech. d'Or.* iii. pp. 183-186, and v. p. 247. We may expect at any time to hear that Damianos has been made to resign, and is succeeded by Euthymios.

² For the story of Nea Iustiniane, see p. 48. King Richard Lion-heart of England conquered Cyprus in 1191, the Crusaders set up a Latin kingdom and a Latin hierarchy, and treated the Greek bishops badly; Venice became

Christians had to submit to the civil authority of the Œcumenical Patriarch like the rest of the Orthodox. But the Church of Cyprus had been ever since the Council of Ephesus an autocephalous Church, obeying no Patriarch. It is so still, and it ranks immediately after the patriarchates as the fifth Church of the Orthodox Communion. It is true that here, as elsewhere, the Patriarch of Constantinople has constantly tried to usurp some sort of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but the Cypriotes have always indignantly withstood him, taking their stand on the decree of Ephesus. Except the patriarchates no other branch of their communion has so good an argument for its independence as the decree of a general council, so on the whole Cyprus has always succeeded in its claim.¹ The head of this Church is the Archbishop of Cyprus, who resides at Nicosia; under him are three suffragan metropolitans,² and about one hundred and forty thousand Orthodox. In 1821 Archbishop Cyprian was strangled by the Turks for helping the Greek insurrection. It is unfortunate that when we come to the present state of these venerable Churches there is nothing to chronicle but the story of violent quarrels. One of the worst of all is now rending the Church of St. Barnabas. Lord Sophronios the Archbishop died in May, 1900. The See of Paphos was then vacant, the only Cypriote bishops left were Cyril of Kyrenia³ and Cyril of Kition.⁴ Each became a candidate for the Archbishopric, and their rivalry has torn the Church of Cyprus, indeed, the whole Orthodox world ever since. My Lord of Kition is a politician and strongly Philhellenic in his sympathies. His enemies say that he is a

mistress of the island in 1489, and continued the same policy. The Turks conquered it in 1571; the English occupy it since 1878. Besides the Latins there have been Armenian and Maronite bishops in Cyprus. But the old line of the Cypriote Church has gone on throughout. For its troubles under the Crusaders and Venice, see Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengesch.* ii. pp. 725, seq., 780.

¹ In the year 1600 Joachim of Antioch made a belated attempt to assert the old jurisdiction of his see over Cyprus. It was Meletios Pegas of Alexandria who pointed out to him that that had been done away with at Ephesus and that you cannot go behind a general council (Kyriakos, iii. p. 66).

² Of Kyrenia, Paphos and Kition.

³ Cyril Basiliu.

⁴ Cyril Papadopoulos.

Freemason. My Lord of Kyrenia is a very pious Churchman and godly bishop. His enemies say that he is a poor, weak creature, quite unfit to guide the Cypriote Church. All the Philhellenes are for him of Kition; the English Government would prefer the Kyrenian. But, scrupulously just and respectful of established order as English authorities in the Colonies always are, the High Commissioner for Cyprus told the ecclesiastical authorities to choose an archbishop exactly according to precedent and their Canon Law; the Government would then acknowledge him. But their Canon Law leaves the final appointment to the Holy Cypriote Synod, and that synod has only two members—these very two candidates. To make a long story short, the storm has raged ever since, and is still unabated. The Œcumenical Patriarch has repeatedly tried to interfere, and has been told each time that he has no jurisdiction in Cyprus. The Orthodox, long accustomed to look to an unbelieving Government to have their quarrels settled, have several times appealed to the English Colonial Office, and our Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has told the Œcumenical Patriarch that the Government would allow no interference in the affairs of the Church of Cyprus. The Kyrenian party tried to get a majority by filling the third see, Paphos, with one of their friends.¹ So they chose the Archimandrite Panaretos Duligeris of Athens, who had already written strongly against Cyril of Kition. But the Phanar informed them (quite correctly) that as long as the Primatial See is vacant they cannot canonically fill any of the others. Again they answered (equally truly) that the See of Constantinople has no rights over their island, and that they would take no notice of its objection. Only Panaretos cannot get ordained. The Church of Greece, once so bitter an enemy of the Phanar, is now making common cause with it against the Slav peril; so Panaretos has been seeking in vain for three Greek bishops who would agree to ordain him, and he remains at Athens, Metropolitan-elect (albeit uncanonically) of

¹ This would have secured two votes, those of the Metropolitan of Paphos and of Cyril of Kyrenia, for Cyril of Kyrenia against one, his own, for the other Cyril. So the Kyrenian would have been elected by a majority of two-thirds.

Paphos, and he has no vote in the Cypriote Synod.¹ One need not tell of all the endless ramifications of this quarrel, how the Parliament of Cyprus is divided into Kitiacks and Kyrenians, how Damianos of Jerusalem is vainly trying to make these two Cyrils agree to elect some third person, how Meletios of Antioch put in his oar—of course, against the Phanar—how politicians and canonists, ministers and deputies, are travelling about seeking to strengthen their sides. Meanwhile the See of Cyprus is still vacant, and one of the endless questions that divide the Orthodox all over the East is that of whether they are Kitiacks or Kyrenians.

These five Churches—the four patriarchates and Cyprus—are the old elements of Eastern Christendom, and so, although they are neither in size nor power the most important branches, they take precedence in the above order. We now come to the Churches that have been formed by separation from the Byzantine Patriarchate. They have no established order of dignity among themselves, so the obvious arrangement will be according to the dates of their independence.

6. The Church of Russia (autocephalous since 1589).

There is only space here for the merest outline of the story of the Church that is really the infinitely preponderating partner of all this Communion. The Russians date their conversion since the year 988. In the 9th century a Norman dynasty of rulers set up the first monarchy over Russians. Novgorod was their original capital. Soon after they made Kiev “the mother of all Russian cities.” One of these Norman kings, Vladimir, the son of Svyatoslav, after having defeated his brothers and made himself the only king (984–1015), became a Christian and forced all his people to be converted too.² He is said to have hesitated between various religions—Judaism, Mohammedanism

¹ I cannot understand why he does not go to Russia; he would easily find consecrators there, or even in Serbia or Roumania. Has he, perhaps, a feeling that that would be too disloyal to the great cause of Hellas, which every born Greek must fight for, even if he hates the Phanar?

² There had been Christians in Russia before, of whom Vladimir's grandmother St. Olga was one.

and Christianity—and to have at last settled on Christianity in its Byzantine form.¹ The fact has deeply affected all Russian history. The daughter-Church of Constantinople has always looked toward that city as her ideal, has shared the Byzantine schism, and Russia is an Eastern European Power, whereas Poland, who got her faith from Rome, is to be counted among the Western nations. St. Vladimir, the Apostle of Russia, was baptized with great crowds of his subjects in 988. A hierarchy was set up under the Metropolitan of Kiev, and was added to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The first Russian-born metropolitan was Hilarion (1051–1072); but all Russia used the Byzantine Liturgy. That liturgy, still read in Old Russian (Church Slavonic), is the only one used in this Church. After the schism of Cerularius, Russia remained in communion with Rome for about a century;² eventually, however, she took the side of her Patriarch. After the Mongol invasion (1222–1480)³ the centre of gravity shifted from Kiev to Moscow, and Moscow had a metropolitan, the rival of him of Kiev. Feodor Ivanovitch the Czar (1581–1598) in 1589 bribed Jeremias II of Constantinople (1572–1579, 1580–1584, 1586–1595) to acknowledge the Metropolitan of Moscow as a Patriarch and the Russian Church as no longer subject to Constantinople. A synod of the other Orthodox Patriarchs

¹ When Vladimir had settled that he would be a Christian he marched against the Empire at Constantinople. Since this religion was a desirable thing, there was of course only one way in which a Norman and a gentleman could acquire it—by conquest. So he seized the Chersonesos and then sent a message to the Emperor (Basil II), saying that what he wanted was: (1) Priests to baptize him and his people; (2) relics of Saints for churches; (3) Basil's sister Anne to marry him. If his wishes were not attended to at once he would come and destroy Constantinople. The Emperor promptly sent the priests, the relics, and the lady. Rambaud: *Hist. de la Russie*, p. 57.

² For Russian acknowledgements of the Roman Primacy, see Gondal: *L'Église Russe*, p. 24, *seq.*, and Nilles: *Kalendarium*, i. p. 100, *seq.*

³ The Mongols (Tatars) under Jenghis Khan ("the great Lord") came to the Russian frontier from Central Asia in 1222. At the battle of Kalka (1223) they annihilated the Russian armies and formed a sort of over-lordship over the Russians which was not finally shaken off till the battle of Oka in 1480, in which Ivan III (1462–1505) defeated them. But they did not really much interfere with the internal affairs of the country nor much influence its development. A very like case is that of the Moors in Spain.

in 1591 confirmed this acknowledgement and gave the Patriarch of Moscow the fifth place, after Jerusalem. The classical number of five Patriarchs was now happily restored to the Orthodox, and they said that God had raised up this new throne of Moscow to make up for the fallen one of Rome. However, that state of things did not last long. The third epoch of Russian history is marked by the change of the centre of gravity to Petersburg. Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg stand for the three periods. Peter the Great (1689-1725), as is well known, set up his capital on the Neva and reformed the whole administration of his Empire. Among other things he reformed the Church so as to bring it under the power of the civil government. For this purpose he abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow and established the *Holy Directing Synod* to rule the Church of Russia in 1721.¹ Jeremias III of Constantinople had to make the best of it and to acknowledge the Russian Holy Synod as his "Sister in Christ." The constitution of this Holy Synod remains unchanged since its formation, and under it the Russian Church is the most Erastian Christian body in the world.² No sovereign has ever been more absolutely master of a Church than is the Czar.

In the first place the Holy Synod decides every ecclesiastical question in Russia, the preservation of the faith, religious instruction, censorship of all books that concern religion, all questions of ritual. It is the last court of appeal for all questions of Canon Law, and all metropolitans, bishops, clerks of every rank, monasteries and convents, are under its jurisdiction. And the Holy Synod is the shadow of the Czar. It is composed of the Metropolitans of Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg and the Exarch of Georgia (p. 305); the Czar then appoints five or six other bishops or archimandrites to sit in it at his pleasure;³ the

¹ Adrian, the last Patriarch of Moscow, died in 1700. The Czar, instead of appointing a successor, set up various temporary administrators until the scheme of his synod was ready.

² Peter copied the idea of the Lutheran Consistories in his synod.

³ Bishops having a diocese sit in the synod for six months each year and for the other six months look after their sees. They can be dismissed from the synod at any time by the Czar.

Czar's chaplain and the head chaplain of the forces are also members. And the chief man in the Holy Synod is the Procurator (Ober-Prokuror), a layman, generally a soldier, appointed by the Government to see that its laws are carried out. Russians themselves realize how completely their Church now lies under the heel of the autocracy. When Mr. Palmer was in Russia, the common joke was to point to the Procurator in his officer's uniform and to say, "That is our patriarch,"¹ and one continually hears of their hope of restoring the old independence of their Church by setting up the Patriarchate of Moscow again.²

Meanwhile the Russian Church is governed by Imperial Ukazes.³ It would be quite untrue to say that she recognizes the Czar as her head. Every Russian would indignantly declare that the Head of his Church is our Lord Jesus Christ, which is, of course, just what Catholic children learn in their Catechism too, and what a member of any of the numberless Christian sects would affirm. As far as practical politics are concerned, however, that answer leaves things much as they were. The question only shifts one degree, and one asks through whom our Lord governs his Church. And the Russian must answer: "Through the Holy Synod." Possibly he would first say: "Through the bishops"; but there is no question that the synod rules the bishops, and the synod is its Procurator, and he represents the civil government. The incredible thing is that Russians boast of the freedom of their Church from the yoke of Rome, just as the Orthodox in Turkey do. If the Church is to have any visible government at all, one would imagine that, even apart from any consideration of theology or antiquity, the first Patriarch would be a more natural governor than the Czar or the Sultan. The Czar's Empire con-

¹ *Visit to the Church of Russia*, pp. 48, 73, 221, &c.

² *E. d'Or.* iv. pp. 187, 232, viii. p. 176, &c. See Palmer, *passim*, esp. pp. 100-105, 110-114, for examples of Russian Erastianism. On p. 160 is an amusing *tu quoque* argument from a Russian to the Anglican.

For the constitution and jurisdiction of the Russian Holy Synod, see Silbernagl, pp. 101-110. The eldest metropolitan presides at the meetings, but has no more authority than the others. See there also the incredibly Erastian oath taken by each member of the synod: "I acknowledge him (the Czar) for the supreme judge in this spiritual assembly," &c. Throughout the Russian Church the Holy Synod is named in the liturgy instead of a patriarch.

³ Cf. *e. gr. E. d'Or.* ii. p. 247, *seq.*

tains about 130 million victims of his government. Of these from eighty to eighty-five millions are members of the Orthodox established Church.¹ So the Church of Russia is enormously the greatest part of the Orthodox Communion; she alone is about eight times as great as all the other Churches together. She is ruled by eighty-six bishops, of whom three (Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg) are always metropolitans, and fourteen archbishops. In Russia the title of metropolitan, which in most Eastern Churches has come to be the common name for any bishop, is much rarer. Besides the three above mentioned, others have it given to them as a compliment or reward by the Czar. In any case it has quite lost its real meaning, and is only an honorary title. No Russian bishop has any extra-diocesan jurisdiction; the Holy Synod rules all equally. There are also thirty-seven auxiliary bishops, whom they call vicars. There are 481 monasteries for men, and 249 convents of nuns.² The last Saint canonized by the Holy Synod is the monk Seraphim, who was an ascetic like those of the first centuries. He spent a thousand days and nights under the shelter of a rock, doing nothing but repeating: "Lord, have mercy on me a sinner"; then for five years he spoke no word, and he died in the odour of sanctity at the monastery of Sarov in 1833. The Holy Synod examined his cause and proved the miracles he had wrought, and the Czar ratified his canonization in January, 1903.³ The Russian Church has missions throughout Siberia, and in Japan, Alaska, and the United States. A Russian bishop with the title of Revel lives at Tokio and governs twenty-five thousand Orthodox converts; the Bishop of Alaska, who resides at San Francisco, has fifty thousand subjects in the States, mostly Uniates from Hungary and Galicia who have left the Catholic Church.⁴

¹ At least outwardly. Under a tyranny like that of Russia, it is impossible to know what people really wish to be. The dissenters are those who have the courage of their opinions even in Russia. Moreover, among these eighty-five millions are the unhappy Catholic Ruthenians who have been so ruthlessly harried into schism.

² Silbernagl, pp. 110-124; *E. d'Or.* iv. pp. 231-235, vi. pp. 396-399. For the monasteries see Silbernagl, pp. 135-146.

³ *E. d'Or.* vi. p. 398.

⁴ *E. d'Or.* *ibid.* and iv. p. 235. There is a Russian mission at Pekin under the Bishop of Revel with an archimandrite and about five hundred converts.

It is impossible to wish well to the Russian missions anywhere. Undoubtedly one would rejoice to see heathen baptized and taught the faith of Christ, if only it were done by any one except by Russians. But Russian missions, enormously subsidized by the Government, are, always and everywhere, the thin end of the wedge for Russian conquest.

Look at the countries where Russia has political interests or ambitions—Syria, Persia, Manchuria, China, Japan, Alaska—there you will find Russian missionaries ; look at places where the Czar has no policy—Egypt, Africa, South America, &c.—there the Church of Russia is unheard of. And Russia, even when it has only a protectorate, means at once intolerance and persecution of every other form of Christianity.¹ One remembers the long list of crimes wrought by the tyrants at Petersburg and by their servant the Holy Synod, the ghastly story of Poland, the Ruthenian persecution, the dead Georgian Church, the Roumanian Church crushed in Bessarabia, the ruthless harrying of the Armenians, and one realizes that Russia and her ecclesiastical arrangements are the common enemy of the rest of Christendom.² And of all the millions of people who rejoice at the crushing defeat of this barbarous State in the late war no one has more reason for joy than the Catholic missionaries who can now again breathe in peace in Manchuria. It is wonderful that, in spite of the intolerance of the Government, Russia should teem with dissenters. Leaving out of account at present the Latin

Silbernagl, pp. 146-147. An Imperial Ukaze has given the Bishop of Alaska two vicars (in 1903 and 1904) for the Russian Church in the United States. See *E. d'Or.* vii. pp. 231-235, and viii. p. 103.

¹ Three years ago Russia and China made a treaty about Tibet. This is one of its clauses : "In Tibet complete liberty of worship shall be established for the Orthodox Russian Church and for the Buddhist religion. Every other religion shall be absolutely forbidden" (*E. d'Or.* viii. p. 50). The treaties of 1858 and 1860 that marked the advancement of Russia in Manchuria put an absolute end to the Catholic missions there. Meanwhile, under the rule of the more civilized yellow man, Leo XIII was able to establish four Catholic sees in Japan.

² Even of her Orthodox sisters. Nothing can exceed the hatred now shown by the Phanariote and Greek Orthodox for Russia, who is responsible for all the Bulgarian trouble, and for the gradual destruction of their supremacy everywhere. For the violent language they use against the "persecutor of all the Churches of God," see *E. d'Or.* vii. p. 366.

and Uniate Catholics, the Armenians, Jews, and Moslems, we find twenty-five millions of Russians who live in schism from the established Church. These people are the Raskolniks and the members of the numberless sects that have grown out of that movement. The Raskol schism began in the 17th century when Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow,¹ reformed the Russian liturgical books. Gradually a number of errors, misspellings, and mistranslations had crept into these books. Nikon carried out his correction of them very conscientiously; he sent an Archimandrite to Constantinople to collect copies of the original Greek books from which the Russian ones had been translated, and his only object was to restore the correct text. The changes that he made were that people should make rather fewer prostrations (*μετάβολαι*) during service, should sing Alleluia twice instead of three times in the liturgy, and should make the sign of the Cross with three instead of with two fingers. It is characteristic of the Slav mind that these changes should have produced an uproar all over Russia. The Patriarch was tampering with the holy books, was changing the faith of their fathers, was undermining the Christian religion; he had been bought like Judas by the Jews, the Mohammedans, and the Pope of Rome (this was specially hard, because Nikon could not abide the Pope of Rome). So numbers of people left his communion, calling themselves *Starovjerzi* (Old Believers); they were and still are commonly known in Russia as *Raskolniki* (apostates). From the very beginning these absurd people were most cruelly persecuted by the Government, and the persecution produced the usual result of making them wildly fanatical. Peter the Great was tolerant to every sect except to the Raskolniks; he

¹ Nikon († 1681) was one of the last patriarchs before Peter the Great abolished the patriarchate. He was a very admirable and saintly person. In 1660 he was deposed by the Government for trying to be independent in ecclesiastical affairs. That he made an enormous fuss about quite absurd things (for instance, whether the sign of the Cross should be made with two or with three fingers), and that he quite lost his head in cases of Popery (he had all the ikons that were painted in Latin fashion seized, their eyes poked out and then ignominiously broke them on the church floor—"Latin fashion" meant that the figures were correctly drawn, as in Western Europe)—these things only mean that he was a true son of the Orthodox Church. Cf. Bonwetsch: *Nikon*, in the *Realenzykl.* xiv. pp. 86-89.

had them hunted down in the forests and massacred, shut up in their churches and burnt, tortured, flogged, and exiled. The whole Raskolnik movement forms the weirdest and most unsavoury story of religious mania in the world; not even the maddest Mohammedan sects have gone to such an extreme of lunacy as these Old Believers. When a Slav peasant gets religious mania he gets it very badly indeed. Their original indictment against Nikon and the State Church was that he had introduced these abominations: to make the sign of the Cross with three fingers instead of with two, to pronounce the Holy Name Iisus instead of Isus, to say in the Creed, "the Holy Ghost, Lord and Lifegiver," instead of "true one and Lifegiver,"¹ as well as various other changes of the same importance. Because of these innovations and heresies they declared that the established Church had become the kingdom of Antichrist, New Rome (which, of course, stood by Nikon and his reform) had fallen as low as Old Rome, they, the Raskolniks, alone were the true Church of God, and Noah's ark in the universal flood. The Raskolniks then split into two chief factions, the "Priestly" and "Priestless" Old Believers. They had few priests and no bishops at first, so the question soon arose: How were they to go on? Some determined to do the best they could and to manage with the few priests who occasionally joined them, or even, in the case of necessity, to receive Sacraments from the clergy of the established Church. These priestly Raskolniks are the less radical party; they have stayed where they were when the schism began, and still differ from the Orthodox only in the matter of Nikon's changes. In 1846 a deposed Bosnian metropolitan joined them, set up a see at Belokriniza in Bukovina, and ordained other bishops; so they got a hierarchy of their own at last. They also, after centuries of persecution, now receive some measure of toleration in Russia, and about a million of them have joined the State Church as Uniates (the only Uniates in the Orthodox world), that is, they are allowed to go on using their ante-Nikonian

¹ The word "true one" instead of "Lord" was just one of the many errors that had crept into the Old Slavonic books. The original Greek is, of course, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν.

books. These Uniates, the *Edinoverz* ("United Believers"), have about two hundred and forty-four churches. When Russians speak of Raskolniks they usually mean the priestly sect, and they are always anxious to convert them all to the established Church. One of the chief arguments used by Russian bishops against any new proposal, such as, for instance, official recognition of the Church of England, is that it would tend to frighten away the Raskolniks.¹ It is among the priestless Raskolniks that the wildest beliefs have arisen. They made a virtue of necessity, and declared that now that Antichrist is reigning the ministry of priests and bishops must cease; they baptize their children and hold prayer-meetings led by elders. And they have broken into endless sects on all sorts of points. One great quarrel was about what letters should be put on the crucifix; where we write INRI, some of them, in spite of John xix. 19, &c., insisted on ICXC (Jesus Christ) only. They began all manner of strange abstinences—tobacco, sugar, potatoes, cooked hare were unclean and never to be touched. Some of them, to hasten the Second Coming of our Lord, preached suicide, and then quarrelled as to whether suicide by fire or by hunger were more pleasing to God. They were all the wildest Millennialists, miracle-mongers, and seers. Horrible licence alternated with suicidal mortifications.² In a wild anarchy of mad opinions and mutual cursing they were held together only by their insane fury against the Orthodox. And these sects, sprung out of the old Raskol movement, still exist, are still horribly persecuted,³ and, as usual, answer that persecution by a tenfold fanaticism.

There are the *Philipovzi*, whose Gospel is suicide by fire, the *Beguni*, who always wander, will eat from no stranger's plate, and practise the abominations of "free love" instead of marriage; there are the *Moltshaljniks*, who never speak; the *Chlysti*, who believe that in 1645 God the Father came down in a chariot of fire,

¹ E.g. Palmer, p. 360, &c.

² There is a gruesome picture of the conventicles of these madmen in D. de Mérejkowski: *Pierre le Grand*, Livre III, "La Mort rouge." French translation, Paris, 1904.

³ But the religious tolerance now proclaimed in Russia has brought them some relief at last.

and was incarnate in a peasant named Daniel Philippov. Their service consists in dancing and in nameless horrors that follow. There are the *Skopzi*, whose god is a man named Selivanov, whom they believe to have been a reincarnation of our Lord and of the Czar, Peter III; they practise self-mutilation, and hope that when they have converted 144,000 virgins (Apoc. xiv. 1-4) the end of the world will come.¹ The *Duchoborz* believe in successive reincarnations of our Lord, and worship a number of their own prophets who claimed to be the Son of God. In 1898, after a very sharp persecution, they fled to Canada, and gave endless trouble to its Government by going out to meet the Second Coming in a place where they would have all died of cold and hunger. But one need not go on describing the blasphemous madness of these unhappy lunatics. That there are about twenty-five millions of Russians who belong to such sects is the only point that is significant. The *Stundists* lastly are people of quite different kind, simply Protestants of the Lutheran type, and entirely respectable in every way.²

Returning to the established Church of Russia after these fanatics, one finds in it as a vivid contrast the profoundest peace. We have seen some—and we shall unfortunately see more—of the quarrels that now rend various branches of the Orthodox Communion; it is relief to be able to point out that there are no quarrels in the Church of Russia. The Holy directing Synod and the Imperial Russian police take care of that. But it would not be fair to say nothing about the Russian clergy but the servility of its hierarchy. Throughout that enormous Empire there must be thousands of village priests who stand for the cause of Christ among their people, who baptize the

¹ Selivanov's secret Gospel, which is the raving of a lunatic, has been done into German by K. Grass: *Die geheime h. Schrift der Skopzen*, Leipzig, 1904.

² For all this movement see Bonwetsch: *Raskolniki in the Realenzyklopädie* (1905), xvi. pp. 436-443. He counts fifteen millions as the highest probable figure; the *E. d'Or.*, that are always well informed, give twenty-five millions as the number (iv. p. 231). One advantage of their existence is that they afford unequalled opportunities for the scientific study of lunacy. Russian doctors and psychologists are taking up the matter from this point of view, and they publish most deserving works on the pathology of mind-disease—they have plenty of material to study.

children, celebrate the holy liturgy, and bring the last comfort to the dying ; who (when they can resist its temptations themselves) do at any rate something towards putting down the drunkenness that is the curse of the Russian peasant ; and who, since they are married and so can never hope to become bishops, know nothing of higher Church politics, but lead simple godly lives in the care of souls. When Mr. Palmer was in Russia he lodged for a time with a parish priest named Fortunatov. M. Fortunatov was a charming example of his kind. His house swarmed with vermin, and the windows could not be opened all the winter.¹ But he was a person of some culture, speaking Latin and a little German.² He had studied the Bible as well as many other things at the Spiritual Academy, and he always helped himself to food before his wife on the strength of Gen. i.³ When his little daughter, looking at a picture-book, pointed to each woodcut and delightedly called them "little god !" he could not understand Mr. Palmer's pious horror. Such "sheer and gross ignorance" he found natural in peasants and women.⁴ He could discourse on philosophy, and had a perfect genius for aphorisms : "Aristotle goes only on experience (!), Plato is imaginative, Socrates religious."⁵ He was no truckler to modern science : "All the modern geologists overturn religion, especially by interpreting the six days of Creation to be six periods."⁶ And he had a most engaging way of putting an end to religious controversy. When Mr. Palmer showed him a controversial letter he had written to the President of Magdalen "Mr. F. criticized it freely and ended by going to his piano and singing the Trisagion, the Cherubicon, the Ter Sanctus, the hymn, Nunc dimittis and Te Deum."⁷ When one learns that so much talent and tact were developed on an income of about £9 a year,⁸ one realizes that the Russian clergy cannot be accused of teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake.

¹ Palmer, *o.c.* pp. 287, 288.

² P. 298.

³ P. 289.

⁴ P. 316.

⁵ P. 300.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ P. 360.

⁸ P. 297. He admits that a student can live on £5 a year only "in the very poorest way." On his £9 he "lived well."

6a. The Church of Georgia.

This Church is not to be counted among the branches of the Orthodox Communion because it has now ceased to exist. We have seen how the Georgians or Iberians were converted by St. Nino, how they became a separate body independent of the Patriarch of Antioch (pp. 17, 18). The Church of Georgia under the Katholikos of Tiflis ¹ had its own rite in the Georgian language. It was almost entirely Orthodox and free from any suspicion of Nestorianism or Monophysism. In the 7th century Georgia was conquered by the Saracens, and a great persecution filled the Calendar of Tiflis with names of martyrs. In the 11th century the country was again free, and the native Georgian kings reigned at Tiflis till the beginning of the 19th century. They were continually attacked and overrun by the Persians; but, on the whole, the land was free, and the valiant Georgian warriors formed one of the bulwarks of Christendom against Islam. Meanwhile the Church of Georgia shared the fate of the kingdom; she was persecuted whenever the Georgians were defeated, and she shared their triumph when they won. Almost inevitably this little distant Church, surrounded by other Orthodox Churches, shared their schism, probably hardly or not at all realizing the fact. But the Russians can scarcely afford to blame her for that, and otherwise no shadow of reproach can be brought against her. The most ancient Church of a heroic people, she deserved to remain one, and one of the most honoured of the Orthodox allies. In 1802, however, the greatest misfortune happened to Georgia that can happen to any nation. It was made a Russian province. And from that time its Church has ceased to exist. The upstart tyrants at Petersburg, of course, cared nothing for the rights of a Church that was by five centuries more ancient and more venerable than their own, nor for the national feeling of the heroic race that for centuries had guarded the frontier of Christendom.

¹ Tiflis, the capital of Georgia, was built in 455. Its name means "warm" (Slav. *tepl*; the same name as Teplitz in Bohemia), from the hot springs near the city. *Iberia* is the older name of the country: it is called *Grusia*, or *Kursia*, too.

They simply applied their usual policy of making every one a Russian who came in their power. So at one stroke the Georgian nation and the Georgian Church were wiped out. What all the barbarians who had attacked the land unceasingly for nine hundred years—Tartars, Kurds, Persians, and Turks—had not succeeded in doing, that the Czar did with one Ukaze. All Georgians were declared members of the Russian Church; the Katholikos of Tiflis disappeared, and his place was taken by an Exarch of the Province of Georgia, who is simply a Russian bishop under the Holy Synod. Throughout the land the Russian Liturgy alone is allowed, just as at Petersburg and Moscow. The Georgian language is forbidden to be taught in schools under the direst penalties. The Georgian Uniates had to flee into more tolerant Turkey, or were forced into the Russian schism. Quite lately, in 1904, when the storm they had brought upon themselves frightened the Russian Government into some unwilling pretence of tolerance, the Georgians hoped that they, too, might at last receive better treatment. So they presented a petition to the Czar in which, with the most piteous protestations of loyalty towards the tyrant who persecutes them, they implored him to allow them again their own Church and their own language.¹ And equally, of course, no notice has been taken of their petition. Meanwhile the only remnant of the old Georgian Church remains in the few Uniates abroad in Constantinople. It is not the Pope who destroys ancient Churches.²

Jugo-Slavia 1920

7. The Church of Carlovitz (1765).

Next in order of time come the Orthodox Serbs in Hungary. We have not yet mentioned three mediæval Churches that have long ceased to exist, those of *Achrida* for the Bulgars, of *Ipek* for the Serbs, and of *Tirnov* for the Roumans. All were recognized as extra-patriarchal, and so held the same position as

¹ For the text of this petition see the *E. d'Or.* viii. pp. 177-178.

² For all this see Kaulen : *Iberien* in the *Kirchenlexikon* (1889), vi. p. 559, seq., and Nilles : *Aus Iberien oder Georgien* in the *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theol.*, 1903, p. 652, seq. See also O. Wardrop : *The Kingdom of Georgia*.

Cyprus. The Primates of Achrida and Ipek are occasionally called Patriarchs, though they were never considered the equals of the five great Patriarchs. We are now concerned with Ipek.¹ In this city (now a small village in Northern Albania) St. Sabbas, the national Saint of the Serbs, set up his throne as Metropolitan of Servia in 1218.² At that time the Latins held Constantinople, and the Orthodox Emperor and Patriarch had fled to Nicæa (p. 227). In the midst of their own troubles, the Byzantines did not care much about the affairs of Ipek, so in 1221 they agreed that the Serbs should elect their own metropolitan, and that he should be only confirmed by the Œcumenical Patriarch. During the troubles of the Eastern Empire in the 13th and 14th centuries, the Serbs managed to set up a great independent Power under King Stephen Dushan († 1355), which at one time stretched from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, and from the Adriatic to the Ægean Sea.³ King Stephen Dushan, who was always at war with the Empire, would not let the Imperial Patriarch rule over his Church, so in a synod of the year 1347 the Serbs declared their Church autocephalous, and gave to the Metropolitan of Ipek the title of Patriarch. Constantinople, as usual, excommunicated them, but eventually, in 1376, had to recognize the Servian Church. In 1389 came the crushing defeat of Kossovo, in which the Turks utterly annihilated Dushan's great kingdom, and nothing more is heard of Servia

¹ For Achrida, see p. 317, and for Tirnovo, p. 328.

² St. Sabbas († 1237) was the son of Stephen II, Prince of Servia. He had been a monk at Mount Athos. He crowned his elder brother, Stephen III, with a crown given by Pope Honorius III. The Serbs keep his feast on January 14th; they call him Sava. Cf. Nilles: *Kalend.* i. p. 446, and p. 438 for the very complete acknowledgements of the Roman Primacy made by the Church and princes of Servia at this time. *E.gr.* Stephen II writes: "I always follow the footsteps of the holy Roman Church, as did my father of happy memory, and always obey the command of the Roman Church." In 1199, a Servian national Synod declares that: "The most holy Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches" (*ibid.*). That the Serbs were also in communion with schismatical Constantinople shows once more how little simple people, living away from the centres of the quarrel, realized its importance.

³ See *e.gr.* Freeman's *Historical Geography*, ed. J. Bury (1903), p. 392, *seq.* and map xli.

as an independent Power till the revolt of 1817.¹ The Servian Church went on for a time after the destruction of the kingdom, but the Phanar persuaded the Porte that any sort of national organization among the Serbs, even a purely ecclesiastical one, was a danger to the Sultan's rule, and that the best safety for the Turkish Government would be in the destruction of the Church of Ipek, and in the submission of the Orthodox Serbs to the Patriarch of Constantinople. So after centuries of bickering and machinations, at last, in 1765, the Sultan put an entire end to the Servian Church. Since then, all the Serbs in Turkey have to obey the Patriarch, although, as we shall see, they do so very unwillingly, and always hope for a great united Servian Church under a Patriarch of Ipek again. But in three cases where the Porte does not rule over Serbs, the Œcumenical Patriarch has no authority either. One of these is that of the new kingdom of Servia (p. 325), the others are those of the Churches of Carlovitz and Czernagora, which still represent the legitimate continuity from Ipek. In 1690, while the Serbs were being much harassed by the Porte and the Phanar, King Leopold I of Hungary (Emperor Leopold I, 1658-1705) invited them to come over to his land and to try the advantages of a civilized country. Thirty-seven thousand Servian families did so, and many more followed in 1737. With the approval of Arsenius III (Zrnojevitch), the shadowy Patriarch of Ipek, they founded the Orthodox Metropolitan See of Carlovitz (Karloca on the Danube, in Slavonia). Eventually Arsenius came himself. So the See of Carlovitz has the best claim to represent the extinct Patriarchate of Ipek. We have seen how the Orthodox Georgians fared under a Government of their own religion. The happier Orthodox Serbs under a Catholic Government have always enjoyed the most absolute freedom. In 1695 the King of Hungary guaranteed entire liberty to them to do whatever they liked, and no one has ever thought of disturbing them since. As long as any sort of See of Ipek existed,² the Metropolitan of

¹ It was a tributary principality under the Turk for a short time, from 1442 to 1459.

² The Turks had allowed a successor (Kallinikos I) to be appointed at Ipek when Arsenius III went to Hungary.

Carlovitz considered himself dependent from it, and at first he described himself as "Exarch of the throne of Ipek." When there was no longer a throne of Ipek to be Exarch of, he became quite independent. There are now six Servian dioceses under Carlovitz scattered through Hungary and Slavonia,¹ with twenty-seven monasteries, and just over a million of the faithful. A last example will show the invariable tolerance and good-nature of the Government of the Habsburgs. Hitherto, the common official name for all the Orthodox in the Dual Monarchy was *Greek-Oriental* (griechisch-morgenländisch); so the Church of Carlovitz was officially known as the *Servian national Greek-Oriental Church*. But they did not like this name. They feel very strongly that they are not Greeks; the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople had destroyed their old national Church of Ipek, and, although they are in communion with him, they cannot abide him and his ways. So they protested. The courteous statesmen at Vienna and Pesth have nothing to do with the everlasting internal quarrels of the Orthodox, but they are always studiously anxious to make every one happy. So they said that, of course, they would be delighted to do anything they could for the Serbs: What would the gentlemen like to be called? They were told; and now the official name is the *Servian national Orthodox-Slav (Pravoslav) Oriental Church*. This body is, of course, in communion with the Œcumenical Patriarch and with all the other Orthodox Churches, but it has no Head but Christ, and, as they sit in peace under the Habsburg double crown, this does not mean the Procurator of a Holy Directing Synod.²

Jugo-Slavia 1920

8. The Church of Czernagora (1765).

This Church represents the other fragment of the old Patriarchate of Ipek. The people of Czernagora (Mons Niger,

¹ Carlovitz, Bács, Buda, Karlstadt, Pakrácz, Temesvár, Versecz. The Hungarian Government pays the Metropolitan of Carlovitz 80,000 fl. a year, and the others 10,500 fl. They have an ecclesiastical Congress to arrange their own affairs, which is entirely independent of the State, and all sit in the Hungarian House of Lords.

² For all this, see the *E. d'Or.* ii. p. 156, seq., v. p. 164, seq., vii. p. 358, seq.

Montenegro) are simply Serbs, in no way different from those of Turkey or in the new kingdom of Servia, and they form a separate principality only because of the accidents of politics. For whereas the Serbs of Turkey groan under the tyranny of the Sultan, and those of the kingdom have lately won their freedom, the valiant men of the Black Mountain have never had to submit to the barbarian. They, alone of all the Balkan Christians, have always kept their freedom; while for five centuries they waged a continual war against the Turk, they have always succeeded in driving him down from the slopes of their Black Mountain. And so the old Servian Church, destroyed in Turkey, set up again by the exiles in Hungary, has always existed independent as the national religion of Czernagora. Till quite lately, the same person was both Prince and Bishop of the Black Mountain. In 1516, Prince George, fearing lest quarrels should weaken his people (it was an elective principedom), made them swear always to elect the bishop as their civil ruler as well. These prince-bishops were called Vladikas, and lasted till about fifty years ago. In the 18th century the Vladika Daniel I (1697-1737) succeeded in securing the succession for his own family. As Orthodox bishops have to be celibate, the line passed (by an election whose conclusion was foregone) from uncle to nephew, or from cousin to cousin. At last, in 1852, Danilo, who succeeded his uncle as Vladika, wanted to marry, so he refused to be ordained bishop and turned the prince-bishopric into an ordinary secular principedom. Since then, another person has been elected Metropolitan of Cetinje, according to the usual Orthodox custom. The Vladikas acknowledged an at least theoretical ecclesiastical over-lordship of the Patriarchs of Ipek as long as that line existed. Since 1765, the Church of the Black Mountain has been autocephalous. Its hierarchy consists of only one bishop, the Metropolitan of Cetinje, and about ninety parish priests. It has thirteen monasteries.¹

¹ See W. Götz : *Montenegro*, in the *Realenz.* (1903), xii. p. 430, *seq.*

9. The Church of Sinai (1782).

One of the chief shrines to which the Orthodox for many centuries have gone in pilgrimage is Mount Sinai, the "mountain trod by God" (τὸ θεοβάρτον ὄρος). On this mountain stands the great monastery of St. Katharine.¹ It became very rich, and has metochia (daughter-houses) at Cairo, Constantinople, Kiev, Tiflis, and all over the Orthodox world (fourteen altogether). Since the 10th century the Abbot (Hegoumenos) of Mount Sinai has joined to his office the diocese of Pharan in Egypt, has always been consecrated bishop, and has borne the title of Archbishop of Mount Sinai. He has always been and still is ordained by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and formerly he obeyed that patriarch's jurisdiction. However, chiefly because of the distance of his monastery from the Holy City, he succeeded after a great struggle in being recognized as independent of any superior authority. In 1782 this position was officially acknowledged by the patriarchs; and so the Archbishop of Sinai rules over the smallest of the Orthodox Churches, having himself no superior but Christ and the seven councils. Since, however, he is ordained at Jerusalem, and since the Orthodox are always disposed to consider that the right of ordaining involves some kind of jurisdiction, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem have continually tried to reassert their old authority over him and his monastery.

The last dispute was in 1866. In that year the Archbishop-Abbot, Cyril Byzantios, had a great quarrel with his monks. Unable to manage them alone and unwilling to appeal to Jerusalem, lest that should seem an acknowledgement of dependence from that see, he sent to Constantinople to ask the Œcumenical Patriarch to help him keep his monks in order. Of course the Phanar was delighted to have an excuse for asserting some sort of authority over another Church, so the Patriarch (Sophronios III, 1863-1866) wrote back that he would gladly support his brother of the God-trodden mountain. Then

¹ The legend is that angels brought St. Katharine's body from Alexandria to Mount Sinai.

the Patriarch of Jerusalem (also named Cyril) heard of what had happened and summoned a synod in 1867, which declared that the Great Church had no authority to interfere in anything that happened outside its own patriarchate, and that 'if there was any trouble on Mount Sinai the proper person to put things right was the Patriarch of Jerusalem. "If we acted otherwise," declared this synod, "people would think that we tolerate such anti-canonical interference, and that we acknowledge foreign and unknown authorities in the Church as well as the only lawful and competent high jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Synods."¹ Cyril of Jerusalem sent the Acts of his council to all the other autocephalous Churches, and once more they all rose up against the usurpation of the Phanar. He also deposed Cyril Byzantios for what he had done and, although Sophronios of Constantinople stood by him, the feeling against them both was so strong throughout the Orthodox world that Byzantios had to submit to his deposition and Sophronios had to resign.² However, Mount Sinai is recognized as an independent Church, and stands with its one bishop and handful of monks on just the same plane as the enormous Russian Church. Its archbishop lives at the Sinaitic metochion at Cairo; he rules over only the monastery and its fourteen metochia, and his authority is very much limited by the council of monks (*ἐν τῇ σύναξί*), who share the government.³ The present archbishop is Lord Porphyrios Logothetes, who was formerly the Orthodox priest in Paris. His Beatitude has brought from the land of the Latins a great dislike for their Church, and when he was consecrated at Jerusalem on October 30, 1904, he took the opportunity of speaking very bitterly against Catholics, a proceeding that was the less graceful in that a number of Catholic priests had been invited to the ceremony and, with the easy

¹ For this story see Kyriakos, *I.E.* iii. p. 62, *seq.*

² Gregory VI, who had been deposed in 1840 and who had seen eleven Œcumenical Patriarchs succeed him, was then appointed for the second time (1835-1840, 1867-1871).

³ For the constitution of the Synaxis, see *E. d'Or.* viii. p. 182. The diocese of Pharan, originally joined to the monastery, no longer exists. The only remnant of the old jurisdiction of Jerusalem is that the name of that patriarch is mentioned in the Holy Liturgy on Mount Sinai.

tolerance that is characteristic of the East, were showing their friendliness by a very respectful attendance.¹

10. The Greek Church (1850).

The established Church of the modern kingdom of Greece is the only body that ever describes itself, or can in any way correctly be described, as the "Greek Church." It is the oldest of the national Churches that in quite modern times have been cut away from the Byzantine Patriarchate, and it was born in the throes of one of the greatest of the many domestic quarrels of the Orthodox. As soon as there was any beginning of a Greek Government during the War of Independence the Greeks declared their Church free from the Patriarch of Constantinople.² The Phanar had so long identified its policy with that of the Porte that the men who were fighting the Sultan would acknowledge no sort of dependence on the Patriarch. The first Greek National Assemblies in 1822 and 1827 declared that the Orthodox faith is the religion of Greece, and pointedly said nothing about the Œcumenical Patriarch.³ In July, 1833, the Greek Parliament at Nauplion formally declared the National Church autocephalous, and set up a Holy Directing Synod to govern it, in exact imitation of Russia. The Head of the Church of Greece is Christ, its governor in external affairs the king. The same Parliament then proceeded to suppress most of the monasteries.⁴ In 1844

¹ The speech in *E. d'Or.* viii. p. 181, *seq.* His Beatitude described these French friars (in their presence) as "locusts that the Western Powers expel like noxious insects." But (as often happens to modern Greeks) the flood of Attic eloquence carried him away, and he got so mixed up with his classical Greek periods that he talked about casting one's nets to fish on all sides for—sheep who have no shepherd! Since then Lord Porphyrios has been fishing for sheep at Cairo. For the Church of Mount Sinai, see Kyriakos, iii. pp. 76–77; Silbernagl, pp. 26, 27; and the *E. d'Or.* viii. p. 309.

² It will be remembered that Greece, which is part of Illyricum, originally belonged to the Roman Patriarchate. It was Leo the Isaurian who pretended to add these lands to Constantinople.

³ Kyriakos, iii. p. 155.

⁴ All those which had less than six monks. There was some excuse for this, as a number of monasteries lingered on with practically no inmates, often with one, who elected himself abbot. But the civil Government had, of course, no authority to do so.^{*}

the same law was repeated : " The Orthodox Church of Hellas acknowledges our Lord Jesus Christ as its Head. It is inseparably joined in faith with the Church of Constantinople and with every other Christian Church of the same profession, but is autocephalous, exercises its sovereign rights independently of every other Church, and is governed by the members of its Holy Synod." ¹ Copies of these laws were duly sent to Constantinople and to all the other Orthodox Churches. Naturally the Œcumenical Patriarch was indignant that his subjects should so coolly throw off his authority without having even consulted him. So he first refused to acknowledge the Greek Holy Synod at all. Among the Greeks, too, a large party resented the whole uncanonical proceeding.

In 1849 the Greek Government, anxious to get the Patriarch's consent to what it had done, sent him the Order of St. Saviour that it had just founded, and a friendly message from the " Church of Hellas." The Patriarch (Anthimos IV, 1840-1841, 1848-1852) took the Order, and then said he knew nothing about a Church of Hellas. However, Russia and the other Orthodox Churches, always willing to humble the Phanar, acknowledged this new sister and insisted on his doing so too. So in 1850 Anthimos held a synod which published the famous *Tomos* (decree). The *Tomos* did recognize the Greek Church as autocephalous, but, still anxious to assert some sort of authority over it, prescribed the way in which it must be constituted. It especially forbade any interference of the State in Church affairs and added an amusing tirade against Erastianism.² It also insisted that the Patriarch should be named in the Holy Liturgy throughout Greece, that the Holy Chrism should be sent from Constantinople, and that the synod should submit all important questions to the Patriarch.³ This *Tomos* excited great indignation among the nationalist Greek party. They had determined to have nothing more to do with the Phanar at all. Theoklitos

¹ Kyriakos, iii. p. 160.

² One wonders what would happen if the Phanar ever dared to talk like this to the Church of Russia.

³ This is just the case of the *causæ maiores* that among Catholics have to go to Rome. It is very curious how the Œcumenical Patriarch always tries (though quite futilely) to be a Pope.

Pharmakides, their chief leader, wrote an angry refutation: "The Synodical Tomos, or concerning Truth,"¹ and the only suggestions they would accept from the Tomos were that the Metropolitan of Athens should be ex-officio president of the Holy Synod, and that the chrism should be supplied by the Patriarch. After a great deal more quarrelling, at last the Phanar had to submit and to acknowledge one more sister in Christ, the Greek Holy Synod. Since then there has been no more question about the autonomy of the Church of Hellas, and in face of the common Slav danger, the Free Greeks and the Phanar have now forgotten their differences and have become firm allies. Since its original constitution the Greek Church has received two additions. In 1866 England ceded the Ionian Isles to Greece, and at once the Greek Government separated the dioceses of those islands from the Patriarchate and joined them to its own Church. Again the Phanar protested, and there was a rather angry correspondence between Constantinople and Athens, but by now the principle that political independence and political union must be exactly reflected in the Church was becoming more and more openly recognized by the Orthodox. So this union was made without much trouble. In 1881 Thessaly and part of Epirus were added to Greece, and again the ten dioceses of these lands were joined to the Greek Church. This time the Phanar did not even protest. The Church of Hellas has now thirty-two sees, of which the first is that of Athens. At present in Greece, as in most Orthodox lands, the majority of these bishops bear the quite meaningless title of Metropolitan, but the Holy Synod has decreed that as the present metropolitans die their successors shall be called simply Bishops, and that the only see with the Metropolitan title in future shall be Athens. There are to be no provinces nor graduated jurisdiction, all bishops shall be immediately and equally subject to the Holy Synod. Of that synod my Lord of Athens is president, four other bishops are chosen by rote to be members for one year, the Royal Commissioner must be present at every session, and without his signature no decree is valid. The Greek Holy Synod, then, is an exact copy of the Russian one, and under it

¹ ὁ συνουδικὸς τόμος, ἡ περὶ ἀληθείας, Athens, 1852.

the Greek Church is just as Erastian as the Church of Russia, with, however, this exception, that, instead of being at the mercy of an autocrat, it has to submit to the even worse rule of a Balkan Parliament.¹ In spite of this, however, the little Greek Church is as orderly and well organized as any of the Orthodox Communion. Its bishops and clergy are reasonably well paid by the State, so they have not the disadvantage of grinding poverty, and the University of Athens has a theological faculty quite well equipped for their education. The two most important theologians of this Church have been *Theoklitos Pharmakides* († 1860), who was the leader of the Liberal school, friendly to Protestants, anxious for practical reforms in the Church, for free discussion and higher Bible criticism, advocating more education and fewer monks,² and his opponent *Oikonomos* († 1857), who had been educated in Russia and the East and was a rigid Conservative, valuing the Septuagint above new translations from the Hebrew, more diligent in the study of the Fathers of the Church than curious about the Tübingen theories, rather fearful of losing the old Orthodox faith than anxious for new reforms. He was also a famous orator and preached the sermon over the body of the martyr-Patriarch Gregory V at Odessa (p. 341), that is by far the finest piece of modern Greek oratory. But he thought that the Septuagint is inspired, and believed in Pseudo-Dionysius. The Greek Church has vindicated its right as a living Christian body by producing a fair proportion of heretics. *Theophilos Kaires* (Καϊρης), a priest, left the Orthodox Church and founded a new religion which he called "God-worship" (Θεοσεβασμός), and which is a sort of Deism on the lines of the Encyclopædists, varied by the fact that its prayers are said in Doric Greek. He was excommunicated, of course, and considerably persecuted till he died in prison in 1853. *Laskaratos* founded a form of

¹ Diomedes Kyriakos is very much concerned to deny the Erastian character of his Church (iii. pp. 155-156; he is professor of Church History at the University of Athens). The laws under which the Greek Holy Synod acts show how hopeless his defence is; see, for instance, Silbernagl, pp. 67-71.

² Pharmakides was one of the many Greeks who studied at the German universities and brought back many German ideas to Greece with them. And of such is M. Kyriakos himself.

Presbyterian Protestantism ; *Papadramantopoulos* a Positivist sect ; *Plato Drakulis* revived the wildest Gnostic theories. At present the enormous influence of Western, and especially French, ideas, which accompanies the feverish anxiety of the Greeks to be a European people, produces, besides most quarrelsome politics and a vast debt, a strong tendency towards free-thinking and scorn of their Church among the young men who dress in French clothes and smoke very bad cigarettes in the cafés at Athens.¹

Roumania 1919.

II. The Church of Hermannstadt (1864).

This is the Church of the Roumans or Vlachs in Hungary. There are a great number of Vlachs in Transylvania, of whom most are Orthodox. Originally, the Metropolitan of Carlovitz was the head of all the Orthodox in the Dual Monarchy. But the inevitable racial hatreds of these peoples led to quarrels in Hungary, as everywhere, and at last the Government, always anxious to do well to all its subjects, granted the petition of these Vlachs to be made into a separate autonomous Church. In 1864 the Metropolitan of Hermannstadt (Nagy-Szeben) in Southern Transylvania, was made the head of the Orthodox Roumanian Church in Hungary, and was given two suffragan sees.² His jurisdiction extends over sixty-two protopresbyteries (unions of parishes like our deaneries) and one monastery, in various parts of Eastern and Southern Hungary.

12. The Bulgarian Exarchate (1870).

The question of the Bulgarian Church, still in schism, is by far the greatest of all to the Orthodox. We have seen that the

¹ For the Greek Church see Kyriakos, iii. pp. 150-201 ; Silbernagl, pp. 66-76, and the *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 285-294.

² Arad (N. of Temesvár) and Karansebes (S.E. of Temesvár). These three bishops are also generously paid by the Government (Hermannstadt, 25,000 fl., the others, 10,000 fl.), form a congress for their ecclesiastical affairs, and sit in the House of Lords. As they have the good fortune to be under a Catholic Government, there is no Holy Synod as an instrument of civil oppression.

foundation of this Church was one of the chief causes of dispute between Rome and Constantinople at the time of Photius (p. 151). Eventually, Constantinople, helped by the Emperors, succeeded in joining the Bulgars to her own patriarchate, sending them the Holy Chrism, and making them use her liturgy. Since then the Bulgars have always belonged to the Eastern half of Christendom. In spite of the old rights of Rome over Illyricum, no one has thought of making them Latins. But they did not remain obedient children of Constantinople either. From the 9th to the 11th centuries the Bulgars also managed to set up a great independent kingdom.¹ In this kingdom was an independent Church, which both the Pope and the Œcumenical Patriarch recognized.² Its head, the Bulgarian Primate, reigned first at Preslau (Prjeslau, now in Bulgaria, between Tirnovo and Varna), and then, when the Emperor had conquered that city back (c. 970), at Achrida (now Ochrida), in Macedonia. When Basil II had destroyed the Bulgarian kingdom, he allowed the Church of Achrida to go on, but he brought it into some sort of submission to the Patriarch. The election of the Bulgarian Primate had to be confirmed at Constantinople. After the Turkish conquest the Church of Achrida met the same fate as that of Ipek. The Phanar persuaded the Porte that the best way of keeping the Bulgars in submission was to destroy any sort of Bulgarian organization; so, in 1767, the Church of Achrida was entirely suppressed, all Bulgars were made members of the Roman nation under the Œcumenical Patriarch, just like Greeks, Serbs, and Vlachs. From that time began the persecution of which the Bulgars so bitterly complained. Of all the rivalries between the Balkan Christians, that between the Greeks and the Bulgars has always been by far the most bitter. The Greeks hate a Serb, a Vlach, an Albanian—any one

¹ Its greatest extent was from the Danube to Epirus, and from the Black Sea above Thrace to the Adriatic. Simeon, the Bulgarian King (923-934), was their chief conqueror, the Emperor Basil II, the Bulgar-slayer (991-1022), their destroyer. This Bulgarian kingdom covered much of the same land as the later Servian kingdom (p. 306). See Freeman's *Historical Geography* (ed. Bury, 1903), p. 376, *seq.*, and map xxxiv.

² King Simeon asked the Pope to make his chief bishop an extra-patriarchal primate. Pope Formosus (891-896) did so.

who has a nationality to oppose to their dream of a great Hellas covering all the Balkan peninsula, but they hate a Bulgar far the most of all. The Bulgars are the most numerous, active and generally dangerous of their rivals. During the horrors of the insurrection of 1903 any sort of sympathy for the unhappy Bulgarian insurgents on the part of a European State was met by shrieks of indignation at Athens against such Philobulgarism.¹ Until 1870, the Phanariot Greeks then systematically ignored the Bulgars. They appointed Greek bishops for every diocese, including Ochrida, which had become an ordinary metropolis; they allowed only Greek as a liturgical language; the very name Bulgar was proscribed and almost forgotten.² At last, in 1860, the Bulgars determined to bear the treatment of the Phanar no longer. As with all the Balkan Rayahs, the only real issue was the political one: they wanted to be a people, and the only way to be a people under the Turk was to have a national Church, a *millet*, in fact. The vital thing was to have nothing more to do with the Phanar. At first they thought of joining the Catholic Church. They applied to the Uniate Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, and were assured by him that the Holy See would allow them to be a Uniate Church, keeping their own Canon Law, and using the Byzantine liturgy in their own tongue. Napoleon III was to be their patron and defender. A large number of them then abjured schism, and a certain Archimandrite Sokolski was consecrated Archbishop of the Bulgars by Pius IX himself in 1861. It was Russia who put a stop to this movement. Catholicism in the Balkans would not suit her plans at all. So the Russian Government tried very hard to persuade the Phanar to allow a national Orthodox Bulgarian Church to

¹ During all that time there were endless examples of this race-hatred. Here is one that made some noise at the time. In August, 1903, two Greeks treacherously betrayed the Bulgarian leader, Thomas Saef, with ninety-eight men into the hands of a whole regiment of Turks. The Bulgars were all killed. Afterwards the Bulgars caught the two Greeks, and the Revolutionary Committee sentenced them to be slowly cut in small pieces in the market-places of two towns. This was done in September.

² Voltaire, in *Candide*, wrote of an imaginary "Bulgarian" army that did "Bulgarian" exercises as one would write of fairyland or the Utopians. He had no idea that there was a real Bulgaria. See Brailsford, *Macedonia*, p. 100.

be formed. As the Phanar would not hear of such a thing, the Russians then turned to the Porte, and made it set up a new *millet*—the Orthodox Bulgarian nation. Since the Sultan had agreed, it did not matter in the least what the Patriarch did, so the *millet* was duly constituted, and the Bulgarian Church was born. To stop the Catholic movement the Russians then kidnapped Sokolski, and shut him up in Kiev till he apostatized and turned Orthodox again.¹ Religious motives count for nothing in this story,² the only thing the Bulgars wanted was to be a nation, and as soon as they found they could be one without the Pope, they gave up the idea of being Catholic.³ What has made this quarrel specially bitter is that the Bulgars are not content with a local autocephalous Church covering a certain area. That is bad enough, but the Phanar has so often had to accept such an arrangement that it would without doubt have done so in this case, too. But the Bulgars have taken more than that. Like the Armenians, they want all their people to belong to their Church wherever they may live ; and so they measure the jurisdiction of their hierarchy, not by area, but by nationality and language. As head of their Church they set up a bishop with the title of *Exarch* in Constantinople, and he and his suffragans, with the consent of the Porte, have jurisdiction over Bulgars all over Turkey. This the Phanar cannot forgive. In 1872, Anthimos VI of Constantinople⁴ held a great synod, in which he excommunicated the Bulgarian Exarch and all his followers, and declared them guilty, not only of schism, but of the new heresy of Philetism, which means national feeling in Church matters. The Acts of this synod were signed by Anthimos, by the four ex-Patriarchs of Constantinople who were then waiting for a chance of re-election, by the other Patriarchs, except Cyril of Jerusalem, who dared not offend the

¹ *E. d'Or.* vii. p. 36. There is no doubt about the kidnapping. See Brailsford, *Macedonia*, p. 73.

² How little religion matters is shown by the fact that when, in 1903, they found that Russia would not help them, they all wanted to turn Catholic or Protestant, to get the sympathy of either Austria or England. Brailsford, *o.c.* p. 74.

³ There is, however, still a small Uniate Bulgarian Church.

⁴ 1845–1848, restored 1853–1855, and again 1871–1873.

Russians by signing (p. 288), and by twenty-five metropolitans and bishops. It has never been repealed, and so the Bulgars are still in open schism with Constantinople. In 1878 the Berlin Congress established the almost independent Principality of Bulgaria. In the other cases (Servia and Roumania), as we shall see, the Balkan States have at once set up an autocephalous Church to cover their territory. In this case it was not necessary, as the Exarchate already existed. So the Orthodox Church in communion, not with the Greek Patriarch but with the Bulgarian Exarch, was declared the State religion of the new principality; and when, in 1885, Eastern Roumelia was added to Bulgaria, the Exarchate was established there, too. But it is still not shut in by the Bulgarian State. The Exarch lives at Constantinople, and rules, not only over the Church of the principality, but over his communion throughout Macedonia and Thrace as well. The first Exarch was one Anthimos, his successor now is Lord Joseph.¹ In the principality there is the usual Holy Synod, sitting at Sofia. As the Exarch lives at Constantinople, he appoints one of the bishops (at present Lord Gregory of Rustšuk) to be his vicar and representative. In the principality are eleven sees; in Macedonia and Thrace the Bulgars have set up twenty-one sees, nearly all of which are rivals of Greek dioceses in the same towns. So throughout Turkey the Orthodox are now divided into two rival communions: the Patriarchists, who stand by the Patriarch of Constantinople—that is, all the Greeks, most Roumans and Albanians (as far as they are Orthodox),² and a few Bulgars who

¹ Professor Gelzer publishes an interesting account of his interview with the Exarch Joseph in his *Geistliches u. Weltliches*, p. 111, seq. See also his very clear and temperate account of the whole quarrel (*ibid.*).

² The *Albanians* are the only Balkan people whose national feeling is confused by no theological side issue. They call themselves Skipetars (the Greeks call them 'Αλβανίται), and consist of two great tribes, the Gega in the north, and the Toska in the south. They speak a very interesting Aryan language, which they try to express sometimes in Greek and sometimes in Latin letters (there is now a great movement in favour of their language throughout Albania, a newspaper is printed in it in Italy, and there is a chair of Albanian at Vienna). As regards religion, most of them are Moslems, who, however, still keep many Christian customs; there are some Orthodox (Patriarchists), and, in the north, very many Catholics, taught and cared for by heroic Fran-

have been frightened by the excommunication of 1872; and, on the other hand, the Exarchists—that is, nearly all the Bulgars and some Roumans. These two Churches hold exactly the same faith, and use the same rites, the Patriarchists in Greek and the Exarchists in Bulgarian, but their mutual hatred is the salient feature of Church politics in Turkey. The Bulgars are always trying to spread their Church among their countrymen everywhere,¹ and the cause of the revolutionary committees in Macedonia is practically identified with that of the Exarchate. The Greeks, who always dream of their “great idea”—that is, of a Hellas that shall cover the Balkans, and have its capital at Constantinople—hate the Bulgarian movement more than anything in the world; they hate the Exarchist schismatic and the revolutionary committees so much that, pending the realization of the great idea, they always side with the Turkish soldiers in hunting down the insurgents.² The schism has caused immense annoyance to the Phanar. Five Patriarchs have already resigned explicitly because of this trouble.³ In 1890, when the Sultan gave his firman for the erection of two more Exarchist sees (Ochrida and Skopia), the Phanar declared the Orthodox Church to be in a state of persecution, and proclaimed an interdict from October 4th till December 25th. As the people then foresaw that they would have no liturgy even on Christmas

ciscan missionaries and Sisters of Charity. And they all unite in reverencing their two great national heroes, the Catholic George Alexander Castriot (Scanderbeg, *i.e.*, Alexander = Iskandir Bey), and the Moslem Ali Pasha of Janina. Cf. Gelzer, *Vom Heiligen Berg*, *u.s.w.*, “Im Lande der Toska,” pp. 182–225, and Brailsford, *Macedonia*, chap. viii., “The Albanians,” pp. 221–289, where he has much to say about the civilizing influence of the friars and nuns. Both Austria and Italy have designs on Albania; but of all Balkan races they most deserve independence and autonomy.

¹ In Bulgaria are about three and a half million Exarchists, in Macedonia about eighty-eight thousand families as against twenty-one thousand Patriarchist families. *E. d'Or.* vii. p. 110; Gelzer, *Geistl. u. Weltl.* p. 125, and Brancoff, *La Macédoine*, for tables of statistics and maps.

² In Brailsford, *Macedonia*, p. 193, is a photograph of the Patriarchist Bishop of Kastoria gracing a review of Turkish soldiers. His Beatitude stands blandly and quite shamelessly side by side with the Kaimakam and the ruffians who are going to hunt down, shoot, and torture the Christian patriots.

³ Anthimos VI in 1873, Joachim II in 1883, Dionysios V in 1891, Neophytos VIII in 1894, and Anthimos VII in 1897. See Kyriakos, iii. pp. 46–47.

Day, they became so excited that the Phanar was frightened, and removed the interdict; but the two Exarchist sees were founded and still exist. In August, 1903, the Patriarchist bishops wailed aloud, and sent round to the Ambassadors of the Great Powers a memorandum in French against the "aggressions of the schismatical Bulgarian Exarchate."¹ The most absurd part of the situation is that the great Russian Church, which from the beginning has been the warm friend and protector of the Exarchists, is in communion with both sides. The Phanar dares not excommunicate all Russia, of course, but in the long list of its grievances against that country, one of the chief is the Russian patronage of the Bulgarian schism. It is true that the Synod of 1872 declared schismatic and excommunicated every one who should aid, abet, or acknowledge the Exarchate, but, except a few very ardent Greeks, no one has dared apply that law to the obvious case of Russia. Meanwhile, the Exarchists get their Holy Chrism from Petersburg, and the Russians hold open communion with the excommunicate. Occasionally a very public case raises a storm of angry protest from the Greek papers, but no one takes any notice of it.² To the furious accusations of the Phanar the Bulgars answer in a language that is common to all schismatics: they are not schismatics at all, but a national branch of the Church Catholic, using their sacred right to manage their own

¹ The text in *E. d'Or.* vi. pp. 408-410. Its language against the "apostles of Panslavism" is extraordinarily violent: "Ces fureurs et ces brutalités," "cette persecution inexorable contre les habitants grecs orthodoxes," &c. On the other hand, "Heureux de nous sentir guidés par la main paternelle de notre auguste souverain le sultan Abdul Hamid, nous souhaitons ardemment à ces provinces si éprouvées le prompt rétablissement du régime de l'ordre," &c. Only a Phanariot Greek can grovel like this. "La Macédoine n'est pas slave," say these bishops, which is a categorical falsehood. They estimate the Turkish and Greek population at three-quarters of the whole!

² For instance, the *Ἑλληνισμός* (an Athenian paper) of November 15, 1902, published a furious protest against an atrocity that had lately been perpetrated at Sipka, in Eastern Roumelia. The atrocity was that three Russians—Alexander Zelobovski, the head chaplain of the Russian forces, John Philosophov, and Alexis Mescherski, both Protopopes at Petersburg—had publicly con-celebrated with Methodius, the Exarchist Metropolitan of Stara-Zagora, in open defiance of Photios, Patriarchist Metropolitan of Philippopolis, in whose diocese Sipka lies. The Russian Holy Synod had sent them officially to do so.

affairs in their own way. They have never excommunicated the Patriarchists : on the contrary, they are ready at any moment to restore intercommunion with them (of course, on their own terms). It is not their fault that they are so monstrously persecuted, but they cannot and will not stand the sort of treatment they received before 1870. They wring their hands at these unhappy feuds, but it is some comfort to know that they are not their fault. As far as one can foresee the future, however, it seems certain that eventually the Phanar will have to give in in this case, as it has had to in all the others.¹

13. The Church of Czernovitz (1873).

This is the communion of the Orthodox ~~Ruthenians~~ and all other Orthodox in *Austria*. In 1775 Bukovina was added to the Austrian House-lands. The Orthodox Bishop of this country sat at Radautz ; in 1781 he moved his throne to Czernovitz, the civil capital, but still kept the title Metropolitan of Radautz. For a time this bishop, like all the Orthodox in the Monarchy, was subject to the See of Carlovitz. But in 1873, as part of the general administrative reforms that more exactly divided Austria and her tributary States (Cisleitanien) from the Hungarian half (Transleitanien), and also because since the separation of Hermannstadt the Church of Carlovitz had become a purely Servian Communion, the Government agreed to join all the Orthodox in Cisleitanien in a separate and independent body. The head of this body (under Christ and the seven councils) is the Metropolitan of Czernovitz in Bukovina, and under him the two Dalmatian Bishops of Zara and Cattaro.² Under this hierarchy stands the Orthodox

¹ For the story of the Bulgarian schism see, besides Gelzer, *o.c.*, Silbernagl, pp. 85-93, and *E. d'Or.* ii. p. 275, vi. pp. 141, 328, 408, vii. p. 110. Kyriakos (iii. pp. 42-49), being a Greek, of course, makes out a case against the Bulgars, but he is not intemperate, and it is interesting to see his side, too.

² It was a strange chance that joined these two Servian dioceses to what is almost a Roumanian See at the extreme other end of Austria. The reason was simply that there are so few Orthodox in the Austrian half that it was not worth while making two independent Churches for them. Practically it would have been more reasonable to join these sees to Carlovitz, but that is in the Hungarian half. For the Orthodox in Dalmatia see *E. d'Or.* v. pp. 362-375.

Church and parish of the Holy Trinity at Vienna, and all the Orthodox in Vienna who are neither Turkish subjects nor Slavs belong to this parish. The one Orthodox parish in Trieste also forms part of this Church. The three bishops form a Congress of which my Lord of Czernovitz is president. They are paid by the Government out of funds amounting to fifteen million florins, and they sit in the House of Lords at Vienna. The Church of Czernovitz counts about five hundred and eighty-four thousand of the faithful, divided into three hundred and thirty-nine parishes which are organized in twenty-one protopresbyteries (deaneries); it has three monasteries in Bukovina, and eleven in Dalmatia.¹ Its autocephalous character is, of course, recognized and accepted by all the other Orthodox bodies. The original movement for separation from Carlovitz was a Vlach one; but only about half the members of this Church are Vlachs and half Slavs (chiefly Serbs). There is now a party of the Slavs who accuse the Vlachs of keeping all the emoluments for themselves, of not allowing the Servian language its due place in the liturgy;² in short, of trying to Roumanize the whole body.³ On the strength of these complaints they want to divide this little Church further into two independent communions, one for the Vlachs and one for the Slavs. The Government has not as yet shown much sympathy with this plan (which the Vlachs strongly oppose), and, indeed, if one were to grant all their wishes, there would be no end to

¹ According to the official Austrian *Schematismus* the exact figures are:—

	Parishes.	Protopresbyteries.	Orthodox Population.
Czernovitz ...	242	12	478,118
Zara	54	5	76,866
Cattaro... ..	43	4	28,722
	<u>339</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>583,706</u>

² Theoretically the liturgy is to be said either in Roumanian or Servian according to the language most used in each parish. Really it depends rather on what language the priest prefers.

³ The present Metropolitan of Czernovitz (Vladimir), a Vlach, is accused of this policy.

the disintegrating influence of Orthodox jealousies, till each diocese became an autocephalous Church.¹

Jugo-slavia 1920

14. The Church of Servia (1879).

We have already seen that there was once a great independent Servian Church, of which the centre was Ipek, and that it was destroyed by the unholy alliance of the Porte and the Phanar (p. 307). In 1810 a part of the lands occupied by Serbs became independent under the famous Black George (Kara Georg). The free Serbs at once broke away from Constantinople (which had carried out its unchanging policy of trying to Hellenize them by sending them Greek bishops and allowing only Greek as the liturgical language), and put themselves under the jurisdiction of Carlovitz. In 1830 Prince Miloš Obrenovitch set up an independent metropolitan at Belgrade with three suffragans. At first the Phanar was allowed the right of confirming their election, but in 1879, as a result of the greater territory given to Servia by the Berlin Congress, the Church of the land was declared entirely autocephalous. This time the Phanar, taught by the Bulgarian trouble, then at its height, made no difficulty at all. The hierarchy of the Servian Church consists of the Metropolitan of Belgrade, who is Primate, and four other bishops.² They unite to form a Holy Synod on the Russian model. There are forty-four monasteries in Servia, and one Servian monastery at Moscow is allowed by the Russian Government to send money to Belgrade and to acknowledge some sort of dependence from that metropolitan.³ On the whole the relations between the established Church of Servia and the Phanar have been friendly. But there are Serbs in Macedonia who have had just the same complaint against the

¹ For Czernovitz see Silbernagl, pp. 207-214; Kyriakos, iii. p. 126; *E. d'O.* v. pp. 225-236, vii. pp. 227-231. Kyriakos counts about four million Orthodox in Austria and Hungary altogether.

² Of Ušice, Niš, Timok, and Šabac.

³ For the Servian Church see Silbernagl, pp. 162-175; Kyriakos, iii. pp. 37-39.

Patriarch as the Bulgars. North of Uskub (Skopia) by Prizrend and towards Mitrovitza especially, in that part of Macedonia that is called *Old Servia*, the bulk of the population is Servian. The policy of these Serbs has wavered continually. At one time they sided with the Bulgars against the Greeks, then when the Bulgars became enormously the most powerful of the Christian parties, they veered round and made common cause with the Greeks against them, and quite lately they have again begun to quarrel with the Greeks.¹ After long intrigues, helped by the Government of Belgrade, the Macedonian Serbs have now succeeded in claiming the two Sees of Uskub (Skopia) and Prizrend (Greek : Raskoprisreni ; Serb : Racka-Prizren) for their countrymen. These two sees still belong to the Great Church, but they now have Servian Metropolitans, use Servian for the Holy Liturgy, and there is every probability that they, too, will break away from the Patriarchate and form yet another autocephalous Orthodox Church. The Lord Meletios, Metropolitan of Prizrend, a Greek, died in 1895. At once all the Serbs both of Servia and Macedonia united to compel the Phanar to allow a Servian successor. They succeeded in 1896, and a born Serb, Lord Dionysios, was appointed, in spite of the cries of alarm of the whole press at Athens. He uses the Servian language in his Churches, and makes no secret of his Philo-Serb policy. The case of Uskub was more complicated. The Metropolitan Methodios, a Greek, died in 1896. The Phanar at once hastened to appoint another Greek, Ambrose, Metropolitan of Prespa, to succeed him. But when he arrived to take possession of his cathedral at Uskub he found it shut and barred and all the Servian population in revolt. The Turkish soldiers forced the church open and Lord Ambrose sang the Holy Liturgy in Greek, but in the presence of no one save the Turks who stood in the nave with fixed bayonets to

¹ The situation in Macedonia is quite simple. Each of the three races—Greek, Bulgar, and Serb—wants to assert its own nationality as far as possible and as far as it can to claim Macedonia for itself. As soon as one becomes very powerful the other two unite against it. Now the Vlachs are beginning to develop a national feeling too, so there is a fourth element. The Albanians do not enter the lists because they are secure in their mountains, and no one tries to Hellenize, or Bulgarize, or Serbiate, or Vlachize them.

keep the Serbs from a riot. He stayed in his diocese till July, 1897, and then, having found himself completely boycotted there, he went back to Constantinople. The Phanar, since the Bulgarian schism, is at last beginning to be afraid of irritating its subjects too much, so in this case, too, it gave in, although as grudgingly as possible. Ambrose obtained perpetual leave of absence from his diocese, and a born Serb, Firmilian, was made his Protosynkellos (Vicar-General) at Uskub. In October, 1899, after long negotiations between the Government of Belgrade and the Phanar, Ambrose was transferred to Monastir (Pelagonia), and Firmilian was elected Metropolitan of Uskub. Even then the Phanar, although they had agreed to the change, sulkily refused to consecrate him. From October, 1898, till June, 1902, he had to wait, Metropolitan-elect, but not yet bishop. At one time the Serbs even approached the Bulgarian Exarch, asking whether he would undertake to ordain Firmilian. But Russia forced the Porte to force the Patriarch to give in; and so at last the consecration took place. Sulky to the last, the Patriarch would not let it be done in either Constantinople or Uskub. At a distant monastery (Skaloti) three metropolitans met Firmilian in a sort of secret way and unwillingly consecrated him. But the Russian and Servian Consuls and the Turkish Kaimakam came to see that they really did it. He used Slavonic in the liturgy, and all the Serbs were content.¹ The Greeks of his diocese, on the other hand, were so angry that they went into schism against him and applied to the Greek Metropolitan of Salonike for their priests. And the Phanar, though it had to submit to Firmilian, makes no secret of its sympathy with them. But the Porte now recognizes these two sees, Prizrend and Uskub, as a new *millet* separate from the "Roman nation" under the civil jurisdiction of the Patriarch. This means that they will soon become an autocephalous Church, and there will be one more fraction of the dismembered Œcumenical Patriarchate to register.²

¹ Firmilian died in December, 1903, at Belgrade; the free Serbs and those of Macedonia at once agreed on the deacon Sebastian of Belgrade as his successor, and the Phanar had to acknowledge him.

² For the case of Firmilian of Uskub, which made a great deal of noise at the time, see *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 343-351, v. pp. 390-392, vii. pp. 46-47, IIII-III2.

15. The Roumanian Church (1885). 15 MAY 1911

The Vlachs, too, have the memory of an old independent Church afterwards destroyed by the Phanar and the Porte. In the 12th century, long after the Emperor Basil II (976-1025) had destroyed the original Bulgarian kingdom, an alliance of Bulgars and Vlachs rose against the Empire under two brothers, Hassan and Peter, and founded a joint Bulgaro-Roumanian State in 1186. In the 13th century under King John Asan (1218-1241), this kingdom reached its greatest extent, stretching from the Danube to Salonike, and from the Black Sea to Prizrend. It was the rise of Dushan's great Servian kingdom (p. 306) that broke the power of these Bulgaro-Vlachs. The Empire conquered back part of their land, too, and at last the Turk came and swept them all away (after the battle of Kossovo, 1388, p. 306).¹ While their kingdom lasted, as usual they set up an autocephalous Church independent of Constantinople. At first they were Catholics, and it was Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) who granted them their autonomy. But they went into schism soon after the fourth Crusade (1204). Their State never included Achrida, so they made Tirnovo (Trnovo, now in Bulgaria) the centre of their Church and the seat of their Primate. We have then a Vlach Church (for it was chiefly Vlach) of Tirnovo to match Servian Ipek and Bulgarian Achrida. After the Turkish conquest, this body was also reunited to the patriarchate,² and the only thing that was left of it was the vague memory of the Vlachs that they, too, had once had a Church and been a nation. The Phanar treated the Orthodox Vlachs just as badly as the Bulgars and Serbs, when they had them in their *Rum millet*. But there was this difference: the Vlachs have always been a feeble folk, afraid to fight against their stronger neighbours, but rather glad to take shelter under some one else's wing. So the Hellenizing policy of the Phanar, that altogether failed with Bulgars and Serbs, seemed to succeed with the Vlachs. When

¹ See Bury-Freeman: *Historical Geography*, pp. 384, 431-433 (the third kingdom of Bulgaria), and maps xxxix to xli.

² This was in 1393 under Bajazet I (the Thunderbolt, 1389-1402), so the Church of Tirnovo had only a short existence.

Greeks publish statistics of Macedonia, nearly all the people they brazenly write as "Hellenes" are really these half-Hellenized Vlachs, men who talk Greek abroad, who sometimes even call themselves Greeks, but who around their own firesides always fall back into the beautiful Romance tongue of their fathers.¹ And lately, since there has been a free Roumania, the Roumans of Turkey, too, have begun to realize that they are a people; they are no longer ashamed of their own language now that it is the recognized tongue of a sovereign State, and they, too, are now moved by very strong anti-Phanariot feeling. In 1829, the Peace of Adrianople gave the two provinces of Moldavia and Vallachia internal autonomy under the protectorate of Russia. In 1864, Alexander John Cusa made himself master of these lands, and in 1881, Charles von Hohenzollern was proclaimed king of what now became an entirely independent State with the name Roumania.² In 1885, as a natural consequence of the national independence, the Church of Roumania became autocephalous. The Patriarch made no difficulty about this; but soon very bitter disputes began between the new Church and the Phanar. The Roumanian Church is governed by a Holy Synod, of which all the bishops are members. The president is the Archbishop and Metropolitan of Vallachia and Primate of Roumania, whose see is Bucharest; after him come the Archbishop and Metropolitan of Moldavia, who sits at Yassi, and six other bishops.³ Each has an auxiliary-bishop (Archiereu), who helps in the work of the diocese, and who also has a seat in the synod. There are now twenty-two monasteries and nineteen convents for nuns in Roumania; for the secular clergy two seminaries and a theological faculty at the University of Bucharest. According to the census of 1899, there were

¹ A curious remnant of this is that in the Roumanian language their own word for themselves (*Roumân*), at any rate in the country parts, is a word of abuse, and means "uneducated boor"!

² He became Prince of the tributary States (Moldavia and Vallachia) when Cusa was made to resign in 1866. The kingdom of Roumania then consists of these two provinces, which had always had a certain amount of autonomy under the Phanariot Vaivodes, now made into an independent State. See De la Jonquière: *Histoire des Ottomans*, pp. 538-544.

³ Of Rimnik, Roman, Buzeu, Huş, Argeş, and the Lower Danube.

about five-and-a-half million Orthodox in the kingdom. The first quarrel with the Patriarch of Constantinople was about the monasteries. In 1864, Cusa secularized and confiscated all the monastic property in Roumania ;¹ part of this property belonged to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, Mount Athos and Mount Sinai, who had metochia in Moldavia and Vallachia. As an indemnity, the Roumanian Government offered twenty-seven million francs to the proprietors. But they refused to accept any compensation, indignantly denying the right of the State to touch their property at all. They appealed to the Porte and to the Great Powers, but in vain, and at last, in 1867, King Charles of Roumania declared the matter settled since the monasteries had refused the money. So now the offer of the twenty-seven millions is withdrawn. What makes the case harder for the Greeks is, that the Roumanian Government is using the money they have taken from these monasteries for their national propaganda in Macedonia, so one can understand the indignation that every Greek feels on the subject of "Cusa's robbery." But this is not the only cause of estrangement. In 1870, the Patriarch (Gregory VI) made a belated attempt to reclaim some jurisdiction over the autocephalous Church. He demanded that all metropolitans and bishops should have their election confirmed by him before their consecration, and that his name should be mentioned in the Holy Liturgy throughout Roumania. But in 1873, after a long dispute, his successor, Anthimos VI, was obliged to withdraw these demands and to acknowledge the complete independence of the Roumanian Church. As in all the Churches that have a Holy Synod, that body is named in the Roumanian service instead of the Patriarch. There was also a great quarrel about the Vlach Skite on Mount Athos, whose monks claimed independence of any laura. Joachim II (1860-1863, 1873-1878) had granted this, and Joachim III (1878-1884) withdrew the concession. The troubles in Macedonia also caused very angry feelings between the Phanar and the Roumanian Synod ; and, lastly, reports were circulated that the Church of Roumania was about to introduce certain radical and

¹ A third of the landed property in Roumania belonged to the Church before Cusa's confiscation.

most unorthodox reforms, namely, the Gregorian Calendar, baptism by infusion, the abolition of the kalemawkion (the universal Orthodox hat for clerks), leave for second marriage of priests, and the burial service for suicides.¹ However, the Roumanian Holy Synod denied these accusations. On the other hand, in 1882, the Roumans took the very serious step of preparing their own chrism, instead of sending to Constantinople for it. This was an openly unfriendly act towards the Phanar. Theoretically, their Church is just as autocephalous as that of Russia, and has just as much right to make its own chrism as its big sister across the Pruth. But the Phanar has always been very tenacious of this right even in the case of independent Churches, and the fact that it has long had to submit to Russian arrogance in this matter did not make it in any way more willing to receive a similar rebuff from Roumania. The Patriarch Joachim III, on July 10, 1882, sent an angry letter to the Roumanian Holy Synod reproaching it for so dangerous an innovation. The synod answered, claiming the same right as the Church of Russia, and the Patriarch, fearing such another schism as that of the Bulgars, was once more obliged to swallow the affront and pass over in silence what he would not openly approve. Roumania is the only Balkan State that now prepares its own chrism.²

But it is in Macedonia that the enmity between Greeks and Roumans is strongest. In this seething cauldron of races there are five hundred thousand Vlachs who are now awakening to the

¹ The Vlachs are becoming more and more conscious that their language joins them to the Western and Romance world, and they are very much inclined to model their institutions after those of the Western States, especially of France. These rumours, at any rate as far as the Calendar, infusion, and dropping the kalemawkion are concerned, were connected with the reports of their Western tendencies that go about among their neighbours.

² Both Belgrade and Athens have already shown signs of an inclination to follow the example of Bucharest. The Roumanian Parliament voted 10,000 francs for the expenses of the vessels and materials needed for the Holy Chrism. The king attended the ceremony, and all Roumania was triumphant at what they considered so great an assertion of complete independence. The Greeks at first denied the fact, and, when that was no longer possible, began a series of bitter attacks against the Roumanian Church, that lasted for three years.

fact that they are neither Hellenes nor Bulgars nor Serbs, but children of the same stock as the free Roumans. The Government of Bucharest has eagerly taken up a national propaganda among them, and spends large sums of money on building Vlach schools, paying Vlach priests, and—say the Greeks—bribing peasants to learn Roumanian and call themselves Vlachs. The famous Apostol Margariti († 1903) was the leader of this Roumanizing movement; and the Roumanian Minister at Constantinople, M. Alexander Lahovary, jealously watches over its interests. So the Greeks, the Patriarchists, are steadily losing their supporters in Macedonia, and numbers of peasants who used to call themselves Hellenes are now becoming as bitter enemies of the “Great Idea” as the Bulgars and Serbs. Naturally, as soon as these Macedonian Vlachs awoke to the fact that they were a separate race, they too, like every one else, wanted to be a *millet* and to have the only special organization possible under the Turk—an ecclesiastical one. Many of them were so anxious to break away from the Patriarch and his Rum millet that they joined the Bulgars and turned Exarchist.¹ But that only caused the Turkish authorities, who are nothing if not consistent to their scheme, to take the names of these Vlachs off the register of the Roman nation and to add them to that of the Bulgarians. Whereas what they want is to be a Vlach nation. So a number of those who remained Patriarchists began to assert their national feeling in the usual, obvious, and, indeed, only way. Their priests said the Holy Liturgy in Roumanian. The Phanar knows that if all the Vlachs go there will be, indeed, nothing but a slender remnant of its Roman nation left to work for the “Great Idea” in Macedonia. So it has set its face desperately against the Roumanian movement, as it does against all national feeling among the Christians that it will pretend to think Greeks. For years there has been a regular persecution of these Vlachs; every priest who spoke Roumanian in church was promptly excommunicated; the Greek papers never ceased heaping abuse on Margaritis and his work, and there has been a long chain of nationalistic squabbles under pretence of ecclesi-

¹ Gelzer counts 430 Exarchist Vlach families in Macedonia, *Geistliches u. Weltliches*, p. 125.

astical disputes between these two parties as ludicrous to the outsider as they are degrading to the Orthodox Church.¹ But now it seems that the Vlachs are going to get what they want. On May 23, 1905, Abdurrahman Pasha, Minister of Justice and Religion, sent to the Œcumenical Patriarch a copy of the *Teskereh*, by which the Sultan has constituted a Roumanian Church in Macedonia. "The Government," says this inimitable person, "treats all the different nations who live under the paternal care of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan on a footing of perfect equality." Therefore it decrees that the Vlachs "are not to be prevented from having their own priests and their own language in the liturgy, they may teach their own language in their schools, choose their own *moukhtars* (village headmen), and be admitted to the election for local municipal councils." "But," continues this Canonical Law-giver, "they shall still be dependent from the Œcumenical Patriarch." "This decision has been submitted to H.I.M. your august sovereign, and has received his imperial sanction. Wherefore I have to inform Your Holiness of what is above." Having laid down so much Canon Law, Abdurrahman proceeds to date his decree, 18 Rabi' al-awwal, 1323.² The latest news from Constantinople is that the Phanar is indignantly

¹ Here is one example for many: "In 1904 a Vlach died at Monastir. His relations wanted to bury him in Roumanian, the Greeks insisted on Greek. The Bishop (a Greek) forbade a Roumanian funeral, the relations would not have a Greek one. As usual, both sides appealed to the judge of ecclesiastical affairs, the Turkish Kaimakam. The Kaimakam, as usual, could do nothing without instructions from Constantinople, and the Porte, as usual, could not make up its mind. So there came a preliminary order to put off the funeral till the Government had considered the case. Meanwhile, as it was becoming quite time to do something, the wretched man was embalmed. Time passed and nothing was settled. Then both sides began fighting over the body, the market-place was shut up, and two charges of cavalry could not disperse the mob. The Wali, desperate and helpless, at last telegraphed direct to the Sultan imploring him to let the man be buried somehow before the mob had pulled the town down. At last the decision came. The Government could not afford to gratify either side, so the man was to be just put in the ground without any burial service at all. See the newspaper report in Brailsford: *Macedonia*, pp. 189-190. "Nothing," adds Mr. Brailsford, "could be more Turkish, and nothing could be more Greek."

² *E. d'Or.* viii. pp. 302, 303.

protesting, but no one takes any notice of that. Once more in the history of the Orthodox Church the Yildiz-Kiösk has spoken, the cause is finished. So the Macedonian Vlachs now have a Roumanian Liturgy and Roumanian schools; they, too, are a millet, and without question the next step will be to give them a Roumanian bishop or two, who will become autocephalous as soon as the two Servian bishops in Macedonia do, and there will be two more independent sister-Churches for the Phanar to recognize.¹

Ungg-slavia 1920

16. The Church of Hercegovina and Bosnia (1880).

The last Church of this list is that of the two provinces occupied by Austria since the Berlin Congress. It is known that the Sultan remains the nominal sovereign of these lands, and that Austria administers them, much as in the parallel case of England and Egypt. The position of the Orthodox Church corresponds to this state of things. According to the general principle that the Œcumenical Patriarch reigns in the Balkans just as far as the Porte, Hercegovina and Bosnia have not been formally declared autocephalous; but just as the rule of the Sultan is merely titular here, so are their Churches really completely independent of the Phanar. On March 28, 1880, a Concordat was drawn up between the Austrian Government and the Patriarch which regulates the position of this Church. The Patriarch is still named in the Holy Liturgy, and the chrism is sent to them from Constantinople. On the other hand the Emperor appoints the bishops without consulting the Phanar (the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to the Porte then informs the Phanar of the appointment²), they consecrate each

¹ A Roumanian paper counts 394,700 Vlachs in Macedonia, 20,000 in Albania, 160,000 scattered throughout Turkey, 220,000 in Greece, and 100,000 in Bulgaria (*E. d'Or.* vii. p. 179). The Roumanian Government has just published a Green Book in French (*Le Livre vert roumain*, Bucarest, 1905) containing a most appalling indictment of the Patriarch's persecution of the Macedonian Vlachs, accusing the Greeks among other things of wholesale murder.

² As a matter of fact the Phanar goes through this farce each time: as soon as they hear of the Emperor's appointment they set up the new bishop with two others as candidates for the see, hold an election, and elect the one the Emperor has chosen.

other, they do not take their turn to sit in the Holy Synod at Constantinople, as do all bishops of the patriarchate, nor do they pay any taxes to the Phanar. To make up for this the Austrian Government pays the Patriarch 58,000 piastres a year. There are now four sees in these provinces; that of Sarajevo in Bosnia holds the primacy, and the present Metropolitan (Nicholas Mandich) proposes to express that fact by changing his title of Metropolitan to that of Archbishop¹ or even Exarch. He receives from the Government an income of 8,300 florins; the other three metropolitans have from 4,500 to 6,000 florins.² These bishops meet in a consistory with an archimandrite and one or two other ecclesiastical persons under the presidency of my Lord of Sarajevo to discuss the affairs of their Church; owing to the exceptional position of their country, however, they do not sit in the upper chamber at Vienna, just as the people have no votes. They are all supposed to be still subjects of the Sultan, whose land is only administered by Austria. There are three Orthodox monasteries in Bosnia, and eleven in Hercegovina. In 1895 there were 673,000 Orthodox Christians; there does not seem to have been any complete religious census since.³ They are all Serbs, and so have no regrets whatever for their former dependence on the Phanar.

When the inevitable happens and the present form of administration is changed for open annexation the obvious thing would seem to be to join these Orthodox Serbs to the Church of Carlovitz. On the other hand Orthodoxy always breaks up and never unites, so probably Bosnia and Hercegovina will remain what they are now really—one more autocephalous Church.⁴ The unparalleled change in these two provinces since they have enjoyed peace, tolerance, and security under a

¹ There seems to be an idea among the Orthodox that the rare title Archbishop means something more than the almost universal one of Metropolitan.

² The sees are: in Bosnia, Sarajevo and Zvornik; in Hercegovina, Hersek (residence at Mostar) and Banjaluka.

³ All authorities, however, agree that the Orthodox population, as all the population of the land, has increased enormously. The Government is now preparing complete statistics and maps.

⁴ For the Church of Bosnia and Hercegovina see Silbernagl, pp. 63-65; *E. d'Or.* ii. pp. 243-244; viii. pp. 35-40.

civilized Government is known to every one and may easily be verified by a visit to Sarajevo. The Austrians have made no attempt to interfere in any religious questions, they impartially protect and support all the sects they found, they pay Catholic, Orthodox, and True Believing religious bodies equally, and you may see there the astonishing sight of Mohammedan Turks, delivered at last from the tyranny of their own Government, going on Friday afternoon to offer most sincere prayers for their protector, Francis Joseph II.¹

This ends the long story of the constitution of the sixteen independent Churches that make up the Orthodox Communion. It is unfortunate that it is almost entirely a story of internecine quarrels and mutual race-hatred. These quarrels certainly do not prevent the fact that thousands of simple Orthodox priests lead admirable lives in the service of Christ and work zealously for his cause among their people. The quarrels, as a rule, affect only the higher orders of the hierarchy, and they are the result, not of the Orthodox faith, but almost always of the hopeless confusion of races and violent national feelings among the members of this great body. But one conclusion seems inevitable. Catholics are also citizens of many States, and are still more divided among different nations. We have at least as many mutual race-antagonisms as the Orthodox; there are Polish and Russian Catholics, there are Greeks, Armenians,

¹ For Hercegovina and Bosnia see Silbernagl, pp. 63-65, and *Echos d'Orient*, ii. pp. 243-244; viii. pp. 35-40. The Russian official papers carry on a campaign of libel against the Austrian administration of these lands. When the governor, Baron von Kallay, whose indefatigable care for the good of the provinces was admired throughout civilized Europe, died in 1903, a Russian paper, inspired by its Government, wrote a scurrilous attack on him beginning: "Yesterday millions of hearts breathed again freely . . . at the death of Kallay a whole people as one man cried out: Glory to God in heaven!" &c. Really Kallay was the man who had built roads, established courts of law that every one had to respect, put down brigandage and religious persecution, and had taught these wretched people for the first time after four centuries of martyrdom what it is to sleep in safety without fear of having their throats cut in the night. But Austria is Catholic, and so the Russians like to pretend that she persecutes the Orthodox. The irony of Russians accusing another State of intolerance is really unique. J. V. Asboth: *Bosnien und die Herzegovina* (Vienna, 1888) gives an account of the enormous benefits wrought in these provinces by the Austrians since they have administered them.

Croats, Vlachs, Bulgars, and Arabs in our communion, but their national feelings do not produce such an endless catalogue of schisms, mutual excommunications and bitter feeling in ecclesiastical affairs—simply because in these affairs we all acknowledge one central authority that has the right to settle our quarrels. Catholic bishops, too, sometimes disagree, but they have a Court of Appeal to whom they can all turn and whose decision is final. The See of Constantinople is no such Court to the Orthodox. It is itself a litigant, and now always the losing one, besides the fact that, as we still have to see, the Great Church itself is torn by what are almost the worst quarrels of all (p. 342, *seq.*). So the conclusion that forces itself upon any one who considers the present state of the Orthodox Church is that that body wants many things to restore it to its old glory, but it wants nothing quite so much as the authority of the Pope.

Summary.

The Orthodox Communion consists at present of sixteen independent Churches, over which the Patriarch of Constantinople has a primacy of honour, but no jurisdiction except in his own Patriarchate. These Churches are, first, the four Eastern Patriarchates—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as well as the old independent Church of Cyprus. Since the schism eleven other Churches have been added to these, which are all formed at the expense of the Byzantine Patriarchate. It has become a recognized principle that each politically independent State should have an ecclesiastically independent Church, so there are the national Churches of Russia, Greece, Servia, Montenegro, Roumania, Bulgaria. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy are four Orthodox Churches—Carlovitz, Hermannstadt, Czernovitz, and Bosnia-Hercegovina. The monastery of Mount Sinai is also an independent Church. There has been great friction about the establishment of most of these bodies; in the case of the Bulgars the schism still lasts. Meanwhile, Russia has entirely destroyed the old Georgian Church. Questions of politics and rival nationalities lead to endless quarrels among the Orthodox bishops, while Russia is steadily trying to absorb the whole body into her sphere of influence.

CHAPTER XI

THE ORTHODOX HIERARCHY

THE Canon Law, liturgy, and faith of the Orthodox Church that we now have to consider are common to all these sixteen bodies. Although they are independent of one another, and, in spite of their quarrels, they all recognize each other as sister-Churches in Christ, all use the same rites (in different languages) and the same formulas of belief. A priest of any one of these Churches can celebrate the Holy Liturgy, and the faithful can receive Holy Communion at the altars of any other one.¹ In short they make up together one great body, which habitually speaks of itself as the Orthodox Church. The hierarchy of this Church consists of the Patriarchs, other bishops, priests, deacons, and clerks ; there are also monks and nuns.²

I. The Œcumenical Patriarch and his Court.

Various Turkish reforms in the 19th century have considerably modified the position of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Although he is still the official head of the "Roman nation," neither he nor any other bishops now have civil jurisdiction ; in their place certain so-called *mixed tribunals* (μικτὰ δικάσθηρια) are established.³ A "national assembly" of the Roman nation

¹ The exceptions to this are, of course, the cases where quarrels have developed into formal schism, as in the case of the Bulgars.

² Monks and nuns are not members of the hierarchy, but they may be discussed in this chapter as being at any rate ecclesiastical persons.

³ These tribunals were established by the *Hatti Humayun* of 1856, which after the Crimean War and Treaty of Paris first made the life of the Rayahs

in 1857 drew up a series of "new Canons" concerning the election, synod, rights, duties, and income of the Patriarch and other bishops, which, having received the Sultan's consent, now determine all these matters. According to the new Canons the Patriarch is assisted in his rule by two assemblies, a *synod* for purely ecclesiastical matters and a *mixed national council* (μικτὸν ἔθνικὸν συμβούλιον) for affairs, such as cases of marriage, wills, and the administration of Church property, which are partly ecclesiastical and partly temporal. The synod consists of twelve metropolitans of the patriarchate, who sit in rote, the mixed council of four members of the synod and eight laymen elected by the Orthodox population of Constantinople. Both assemblies sit for two years and are then dissolved, after which new ones are elected.

When the see is vacant a new Patriarch is chosen in this way. Every candidate must be a subject of the Porte.¹ Each metropolitan of the patriarchate may propose one candidate, the mixed council chooses three candidates (by a majority of two-thirds); the list is then sent to the Porte, which may strike off not more than three names. The mixed council chooses out of this corrected list three persons, and the synod elects one of these three. Lastly, the Patriarch-elect must be confirmed by the Sultan, who can even now reject him. As soon as he is finally appointed the new Patriarch pays an official visit to the Grand Wezir, who gives him, in the Sultan's name, his *berat*,² and makes him a present of a handsome suit of clothes (a kaftan, cloak, and hat), a patriarchal staff and a white horse. The Patriarch-elect must then visit all the other Ministers of the Porte, and on the next day he is solemnly enthroned in his cathedral (St. George's Church in the Phanar), in the presence of the Turkish officials, who first read out the *berat*. The Metropolitan of Heraclea has the right of enthroning the new Patriarch (it is the last shadow more tolerable. It also abolished the punishment of death for a Christian who, having turned Moslem, went back to his original faith, and forbade any one to persecute or abuse the religion of any subjects of the Porte.

¹ He must also be a bishop who has governed his diocese without blame for at least seven years.

² The Patriarch has still to pay a large sum of money for the *berat*.

of the authority he once had over the See of Byzantium): he seats him on the throne, and gives him his hat and staff, while the people cry out "Worthy!" (ἄξιος) three times. Then follows the Holy Liturgy, and the people are dismissed with the Patriarch's blessing.¹ Theoretically the Patriarch can be deposed only for some very grave offence against the Church or State. As a matter of fact, perhaps the greatest abuse in the modern Orthodox Church is the incredible way in which the Patriarchs of Constantinople are changed. Sometimes the Sultan deposes them, but much more often it is the Orthodox themselves (always divided into endless parties), who petition for their removal. And the Porte grants their request—it gets a new fee for every new *berat*. Scarcely any Patriarch reigns as long as two years before he is deposed; and there are at this moment four ex-Patriarchs waiting in angry retirement till their parties get the upper hand again and they are re-elected. The Patriarch's title is: "The most holy, the most divine, the most wise Lord, the Lord Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome and Œcumenical Patriarch."² He is addressed as "Your Most Divine Holiness" (ἡ ὑμετέρα θειοτάτη Παναγιότης = really "All-Holiness"), and it is polite to describe oneself when addressing him as "your least and the commands of your Holiness awaiting servant."³ He uses as arms on his seal a spread-eagle imperially crowned. His extra-liturgical dress is a brown or black cassock (the usual monk's dress), and over this the *Mandyas* (μανδύας) a long brown cloak having at each of its four corners a square of pale blue and around the lower edge two white and one red band. He wears a violet kalemavkion (καλημαύκιον, the invariable hat of the Orthodox clergy, like a top-hat without a brim and with a

¹ Silbernagl, pp. 9-15; Kyriakos, iii. pp. 32-34; Müllinen, pp. 8-9.

² Ὁ παναγιώτατος, ὁ θειότατος, ὁ σοφώτατος κύριος, ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης καὶ πατριάρχης οἰκουμενικός.

³ These titles and addresses are the result of modifications introduced by the modesty of the late Patriarch, Constantine V. Before his time the other Orthodox bishops had to begin their letters to him in this manner: "All-holiest Lord, glorious, God-crowned, God-uplifted, and God-favoured one! Servilely I cast myself before you and kiss your sacred hands and venerable feet" (Gelzer, *Geistl. u. Weltl.* p. 25).

veil hanging down behind), with a light blue cross in front.¹ He also enjoys the right of riding a horse (which until quite lately no other Rayah in Turkey might do), of being accompanied by his followers in the street, of having a cross and two candles borne before him. Every bishop and priest in the patriarchate must say his name in the Holy Liturgy.² The recent history of the Œcumenical Patriarchs is neither dignified nor edifying. We can, however, first mention a story that is entirely glorious. In 1822, while the War of Greek Independence was at its height and the Turks had suffered some bad defeats, Gregory V (1797-1798, 1806-1808, 1818-1822) was Patriarch of Constantinople. He had taken no sort of part in the war,³ but he was the responsible head of the Rum millet that was then revolting against the Sultan (Mahmud II, 1808-1839), and as the Porte could not defeat the insurgents it revenged itself upon the old Patriarch. On Easter Sunday morning (April 22, 1822), immediately after the Holy Liturgy, a messenger arrived from the palace and ordered the metropolitans present to depose Gregory and to choose a successor. Tremblingly the wretched bishops obeyed. They hurriedly elected Eugene II (1821-1822), and while they were robing him inside the patriarchal palace, Gregory was led forth and hanged over his own gate, still in his sacred vestments. The body was left hanging for two days as a warning; it was then cut down and given to the Jews to be dragged through the streets and thrown into the sea. In the night the Greeks recovered his relics and took them in a ship to Odessa, where

¹ The Patriarch's liturgical vestments are the same as those of other bishops (p. 405).

² Silbernagl, pp. 18-19. The Porte pays the Patriarch of Constantinople 500,000 piastres a year, the metropolitans' fees come to 370,000 piastres, the faithful contribute 130,000 piastres, Austria pays 58,000 piastres for Hercegovina and Bosnia. So he has an income of 1,058,000 piastres (£9,522) a year. Really he receives much more than this, as he has all the property of bishops, priests, and monks who die without legal heirs, and very many stole-fees and presents. He has to pay the Porte 20,000 piastres, and 10,000 piastres to the Sultan's guard a year, as well as the bribe for his *berat* (Silbernagl, pp. 19-20).

³ In 1821, forced by the Sultan, he had even excommunicated the patriot Greeks.

they were buried with such honour as a martyr for the cause of Hellas deserved; and Oikonomos made an impassioned funeral oration over the grave. In 1871 the relics were brought to Athens, and now outside the Athenian University there stands a statue of the old martyr-Patriarch.¹ The very latest affairs of the Œcumenical Patriarchate are as confused and unedifying as any part of its long history. In 1894 Lord Neophytos VIII occupied the see. He was a prelate who really cared for the dignity and independence of his Church, and by way of restoring them he ventured on a feeble attempt at resisting the tyranny of the Porte in canonical matters. But when he asked the other Orthodox Churches to help him (Russia could have claimed almost anything as the acknowledged protector of all Orthodox Rayahs), their jealousy of the Phanar was so much greater than their zeal for ecclesiastical independence that no one would do anything. The Bulgarian trouble, to which of course he could not put an end, alienated his own friends—they always seem to accuse the perfectly helpless Patriarch when the Bulgars become specially unbearable—so the Porte had no difficulty in making them depose him. On October 25 (O.S.), 1894, the synod and the mixed council agreed that he must resign, and a deputation of five members waited on him to inform him of their unanimous decision. So Neophytos VIII had to go back to private life in his house on the Antigone Island.² Having got rid of the Patriarch, the synod and the mixed council quarrelled so badly about his successor that their members excommunicated each other, and things came to an absolute block, till the Minister of Religions, Riza Pasha, wrote to say that he had annulled all their acts, and that they were to elect a new Patriarch at once. In defiance of the law the Porte struck off seven names from the first list of twenty-eight candidates which was sent up; one of these names was that of Germanos of Heraclea, who would otherwise almost certainly have been chosen. The popular candidate was the

¹ Kyriakos, iii. p. 20; W. A. Phillips, *War of Greek Independence*, pp. 76-77.

² It was here that Professor Gelzer visited him in 1899 (*Geistl. u. Weltl.* pp. 48-50). He lives with his nephew, who is a doctor.

ex-Patriarch, Joachim III (1878-1884), but (it was said at the time) Germanos managed to get his name struck off too; so at last Anthimos VII (Metropolitan of Leros and Kalymnos) was elected. There was a tumult at his enthronement; the people wanted Joachim, and would cry "Unworthy" (*Ἀνθίμος ἀνάξιος*) instead of the proper form. Germanos had prudently retired to Vienna. However, Lord Anthimos began the reign in which he chiefly distinguished himself by his unpardonably offensive answer to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII (p. 435). In two years the popular party succeeded in having him deposed. The immediate reason was the affair of Ambrose of Uskub (p. 326), in which he was accused of betraying the cause of Hellas. No accusation could have been more unjust. The cause of Hellas is the one thing that no Œcumenical Patriarch ever betrays; he was only helpless before the Porte and the Russians. He did his best to keep his see. As soon as he heard that the synod wanted him to retire he suspended the leaders of the opposition and ordered them to go back to their dioceses. Of course they refused to obey. Poor Anthimos did all a man could. He went to the Yildiz-Kiosk and implored the Sultan to protect him, but the Sultan had other things to think about, and, on February 8, 1897, he went to swell the number of ex-Patriarchs, who wait in hope of being some day re-elected.¹ There were now three—Joachim III, Neophytos VIII, and Anthimos VII. Constantine V (Valiades) was elected Patriarch in April. Lord Constantine seems to have been one of the best of all the later Œcumenical Patriarchs. He set about reforming the education of priests, insisted that the services of the Church should be celebrated with proper reverence, and modified some of the incredibly pretentious etiquette which his court had inherited from the days of the old Empire.² There seemed no possible reason why he should be deposed, except that the parties of the ex-Patriarchs wanted their candidates to have another

¹ Gelzer saw him too, sitting on the same bench as his old rival, Neophytos VIII (*o.c. ibid.*).

² This was the Patriarch whom Gelzer saw in 1899, and of whom he gives a charming account (*Geistl. u. Weltl.* pp. 25-30).

chance. In the spring of 1901 it was first rumoured that Lord Constantine V was shaking on his throne. Twelve metropolitans of his synod and six laymen in the mixed council voted for his resignation. The rich bankers and merchants of the Phanar were all in favour of Germanos Karavangelis, of Pera. Constantine tried to remove that danger by sending him to be Metropolitan of Kastoria, a long way off in Macedonia. Nevertheless, on April 9th, Constantine's resignation was demanded by both synod and mixed council. But he did not want to resign, and for a time the Porte supported him. The Greek paper *Anatolia*, strongly partizan of the ex-Patriarch, Joachim III, all too hurriedly announced that Constantine had ceased to reign. It was immediately suppressed by the Government, and its proprietor was put in prison. The free Greeks of the kingdom were also all for Constantine. But in Holy Week his metropolitans again waited on him with the demand that he should resign. He was naturally indignant that they should disturb him during these august days, and he declared that his health was perfectly good and that he intended to go on presiding over the Orthodox Church. Four metropolitans were on his side. He celebrated the services of Holy Week surrounded by these four, but boycotted by all the rest of his synod. The opposition then sent an order to the four, forbidding them to communicate with the deposed one, and they besieged the Minister of Religions, Abdurrahman, with petitions for his removal. The Porte tried to save him as long as it could, but the opposition was too strong. Again there was an absolute block at the Phanar. The synod refused to sit under Constantine ; and so he fell. He retired to Chalki, and Joachim III was re-elected. Lord Joachim, the reigning Patriarch, had already occupied the throne of Constantinople from 1878 to 1884. Since then he had been an ex-Patriarch with a strong party demanding his re-election. On Friday,

¹ This is the person who had composed the answer to Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical (p. 435, n. 1), who let himself be photographed with Turkish murderers (p. 321, n. 2), who declared himself a freethinker to Mr. Brailsford, and kept a photograph of the head of a Bulgar whom he had had murdered (*Macedonia*, p. 193).

June 7 (O.S.), 1901, after the fall of Constantine V, he was chosen by eighty-three votes, and the Porte then gave him his *berat*.¹

One of the first steps His Holiness took was to present to the synod the following questions for their consideration: the composition of an Encyclical letter to all the other Orthodox Churches with a view of taking some common action (probably a general council) to put an end to all the questions that disturb their mutual good understanding (the aggression of Russia, the Macedonian troubles, the quarrels at Antioch and Cyprus, and, above all, the Bulgarian schism); secondly, he proposed the question of the reunion of Christendom, and especially of union with the Old Catholics (he did not mention the Church of England expressly) as a thing to be yet again attempted, and he submitted to their special attention the question of the Calendar (p. 398), the reform of the monasteries, and possibly a modification of the four long fasts observed by the Orthodox.² This measure argues a prelate who is both zealous for the good estate of his Church and wise in seeing her weaknesses. And, indeed, one hears nothing but what is good of Lord Joachim III. Unhappily the old jealousies against the Phanar still go on among the other Orthodox Churches, and so they are little disposed to help his efforts. He sent round a wise and edifying Encyclical,³ in which he asked the sister-Churches to consider whether some steps could not be taken towards reunion with the other Christian bodies. He divides these other bodies strangely into three classes—the “Western Church” (*i.e.*, of course, the Latins), the “Protestant Church” (which is, indeed, a comprehensive term), and, lastly, the infinitesimal “Old Catholic Church.” His

¹ The other candidates were Constantine of Chios (seventy-two votes), and Polycarp of Varna (sixty-nine votes).

² *E. d'Or.* v. pp. 243–245.

³ The text is published in the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἀλήθεια* of April 4, 1903. It is significant that the Church of Antioch is left out from the address at the beginning. The letter is addressed to the “Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, and to the autocephalous Churches of Cyprus, Russia, Greece, Roumania, &c.” Joachim regarded Meletios of Antioch as a usurper. Of course Bulgaria is ignored too.

Holiness speaks of the Latins with every possible charity, moderation, and courtesy, and hopes for reunion with us. Which hope may God fulfil. The difference of his tone from that of Anthimos VII, in the famous answer to Pope Leo XIII, is very remarkable. The answers of the sister-Churches, however, show how little they are disposed to listen to the voice of their honorary chief. Alexandria and Cyprus did not answer at all. Lord Photios of Alexandria is still angry with the Phanar, and the quarrel between the two Cyrils is still raging at Cyprus. Jerusalem answered cordially and sympathetically. The Patriarch Damianos said that it is unhappily hopeless to think of reunion with Latins or Protestants as long as they go on proselytizing in the East. But union with the Anglicans is possible and very desirable. The Calendar should be reformed, but not till the Latins cease their "scandalous proselytizing." Athens answered that no union is possible, least of all with the Old Catholics, who will not give a plain account of what they do or do not believe. Bucharest said that the only union possible would be the conversion of Latin and Protestant heretics to the one true Orthodox Church; the Old Catholics are specially hopeless, because they have given up confession and fasting, try to unite to the Anglicans, and do not know what they themselves believe. His Holiness had better let the Calendar alone. Belgrade likes the idea of union with the Old Catholics especially. Both the Julian and the Gregorian Calendars are wrong. What the Orthodox want is a quite new one. Russia answered at great length and very offensively. What, said the Holy Russian Synod, is the good of talking about reunion with other bodies when we are in such a state of disorder ourselves? It went on to draw up a list of their domestic quarrels, and hinted plainly that they were all the fault of the Phanar. For the rest, union with the Latins is impossible, because of the unquenchable ambitions of the See of Rome, which long ago led to her fall. As for the Anglicans, the Church of Russia has always been well disposed towards them: "We show every possible condescension to their perplexities, which are only natural after so long a separation. But we must also loudly proclaim the truth of

our Church and her office as the one and only heir of Christ, and the only ark of salvation left to men by God's grace." They are also friendly to the Old Catholics, and have already established commissions to examine the faith of both these bodies. As for the Calendar, His Imperial Majesty the Czar is already considering the question. The whole tone of the letter, as one might have expected, is that the Church of Russia alone is quite competent to do whatever is wanted. The See of Constantinople has always been rather a hindrance and source of trouble than a help.¹ So far then Lord Joachim III has shown himself a wise and admirable Patriarch. Alas ! he has one fault, and that is an unpardonable one. He has already reigned five years, and the rival parties think it is quite time for him to retire, so as to give their favourites another chance. Already the opposition to him in his synod has declared itself. In January, 1905, there was a scene. Lord Prokopios of Durazzo led the anti-Joachimite side, and in a long speech attacked a number of the Patriarch's actions. "Holy man of Durazzo," said Joachim angrily, "thou hast learnt thy lesson well. These are the plots brewed in the conventicles of the holy man of Ephesus." "All holy one," said Joachim of Ephesus, "there are no conventicles held in my house." Then he, too, made a list of accusations, and eight metropolitans ranged themselves on his side. The Patriarch tried the old and always hopeless expedient of forbidding Prokopios to attend the meetings of the synod. That only brought matters to a climax. The eight members at once deposed Joachim and telegraphed the news to Petersburg, Bucharest, Athens, Belgrade, &c. Then, as usual, both sides appealed to the Sultan. Abdulhamid once more had the exquisite pleasure of lecturing them all on charity and concord. "Patriarch Effendi," says he, "you are breaking the laws of the Church. You have no right to exclude Prokopios, and you must make it up with the eight metropolitans." Then he sent for the eight. "My metropolitans, what right have you to depose the Patriarch ? It is not right. You must make it up with Lord Joachim." He further hinted that if the precepts of

¹ The texts of these letters are in the *E. d'Or.* vii. pp. 91-99.

their own Prophet are not enough to control their passions and to make them live in peace, he would have to refer the matter to the invincible Ottoman Police. Eventually the Minister of Religions, our inimitable friend Abdurrahman, last November, sent a note to Joachim, telling him his duty and the Canons of the Orthodox Church, and exhorting him to be a good Patriarch ; but so far the Porte is for him and he still reigns. However, the opposition is by no means dead, and we may hear any day that he has gone the weary way to Chalki once more, and that a new bishop rules over the Great Church.¹

Besides the synod and mixed council the Œcumenical Patriarch has a court or curia of officers, whose titles and functions in most cases come down from the days of the old Empire. They are : the *Great Economist* (μέγας οἰκόνομος), a deacon who administers the finances, presents candidates for ordination, and governs the patriarchate when the see is vacant ; the *Great Sakellarios*, who looks after the monasteries ; the *Great Sacristan* (μέγας σκευοφύλαξ) ; the *Chancellor* (χαρτοφύλαξ) ; the *Sakellion* (σακελλίων), who is responsible for convents ; the *Protonotary* (πρωτονοτάριος, Byzantine Greek has a number of Latin and hybrid words), who is the Patriarch's secretary ; the *Warden of the Robes* (καστήρηνσιος) ; the *Rephendarios* (ῥεφενδάρσιος), who is sent on embassies ; the *Great Logothete*, who keeps the seal ; the *Hypomnematographos*, who writes down protocols of synods and counts votes ; the *Protekdikos*, who is judge of smaller cases ; the *Hieromnemon*, who keeps the liturgical books ; the *Hypogonaton*, who helps vest the Patriarch and holds the paten at Holy Communion ; the *Hypomimneskon*, who receives petitions ; and the *Didaskalos*, who explains the

¹ The details of all this account will be found in the Greek newspapers of the last eight years. See also Tournebize : *L'Église grecque-orthodoxe*, i. pp. 57-61. *E. d'Or.* iv. pp. 307-309, 368-373 ; v. pp. 243-244 ; vi. pp. 275-277 ; vii. 91-99 (the answers to Joachim III's Encyclical), 305-306, 362-366 ; viii. pp. 51-53, 179-181. The ex-Patriarch, Anthimos VII, has written a letter full of reproaches to Joachim III ; but the popular candidate for the succession seems to be Joachim of Ephesus. The language they use about each other is incredible. This Joachim is pleasantly described in the Patriarch's organ as an animal who should carry parcels and an eater of hay.

Gospel and the Psalms to all the others. The above-named persons, divided into three sets of five each, stand on the right side of the altar when the Patriarch celebrates. On the left are seventeen officers, namely, the *Protopope* and the *Second Priest* (δευτερεύων), the *Exarch*,¹ the *Head of Churches* (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν), who keeps the holy chrism, the *Catechist*, *Periodeutes*, who visits country churches, the *Baptist*, *First Singer* (πρωτοψάλτης), two other Singers and *Primicerii*, the *Choirmaster* (πρώξιμος), who tells the others which is the dominant of the mode they are singing, *Master of Ceremonies*, *Church-cleaner*, *Doorkeeper*, *Lamp-lighter*, the *Dean*, who persuades the clergy that their cathedratic (patriarchal fees) are not too great, and the *Deputy*, who goes before the Patriarch and tells the crowd to stand back. So the Œcumenical Patriarchs, during their short reigns, are able to enjoy the dignity of quite a large court. The Great Logothete is the only one of these officers whose position is really important. He is always a layman, whose appointment must be confirmed by the Porte, and he is the official intermediary between the Phanar and the Turkish Government. All synodal acts, appointments to sees, depositions, and canonical acts generally must be countersigned by him. And in the intrigues that flourish round the throne of Constantinople, the Great Logothete plays a very important part.²

2. The other Patriarchs, Bishops, Priests, and Clerks.

We have seen something of the state of the other patriarchates at the present time. Here we need only add their titles and arms. In Egypt, Libya, and Arabia the Orthodox are ruled by the "most divine and all-holy Lord, the Lord Patriarch of Alexandria, Judge of the World."³ He

¹ This is the person who examines marriage cases—Defensor matrimonii. He must not be confused with the Bulgarian Exarch.

² Silbernagl: *Verfassung*, u.s.w. pp. 20-23.

³ Ὁ θεϊότατος καὶ παναγιώτατος κύριος, ὁ πατριάρχης Ἀλεξανδρείας, δικαστὴς τοῦ κόσμου. This curious title may be a reminiscence of the days when St. Cyril of Alexandria, the great hero of the Egyptian Church, judged and deposed Nestorius of Constantinople at Ephesus (431). The Coptic Patriarch uses it too. I have also seen a longer title adding that he is Patriarch of Abyssinia, Nubia, and all the places where St. Mark preached.

is also called "Your All-holiness" (*παναγιότης*). He bears as arms the lion of St. Mark, sejant-guardant, crowned and winged, bearing in the dexter jambe a closed book surmounted by a cross urdy. The head of Orthodox Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia is the "most divine and holy Lord, the Lord Patriarch of the great God-favoured city Antioch and of all the East."¹ He is his "Holiness" (*αγιότης*) only, and he bears for his arms a representation of the Apostles' Church at Antioch, between the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul statant affronty attired with their symbols. Over Orthodox Palestine reigns the "most divine and holy Lord, the Lord Patriarch of the Holy City Jerusalem and of the whole Land of Promise."² His is called his "Holiness," and bears a representation of the Church of the Anastasis.³ The chief bishop of Cyprus, when at last there is one, will be "Archbishop of Justiniane and all Cyprus."⁴ Except in Russia nearly all Orthodox bishops are metropolitans. A few have real provinces and suffragans (these suffragans are the only persons usually called bishops), the great majority have no extra-diocesan jurisdiction, but all depend immediately on their Patriarch or Holy Synod, although they all bear the quite meaningless title metropolitan instead of

¹ 'Ο θεότατος καὶ ἀγιώτατος κύριος, ὁ πατριάρχης τῆς μεγάλης καὶ θειοτάτης πόλεως Ἀντιωχείας καὶ πάσης τῆς ἀνατολῆς. This title is not really so pretentious as it sounds. The "East" (*ἀνατολή*) means the old Roman Diocese of the East, ruled by the Comes Orientis, see p. 22. His Holiness of the God-favoured city also has a longer title including Cilicia, Iberia, Syria, Arabia, and all the East—melancholy remnant of better days.

² 'Ο θεότατος καὶ ἀγιώτατος κύριος, ὁ πατριάρχης τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

³ I have only seen these arms on seals, and cannot find the tinctures. Probably they are all very late. Heraldry is a Western art. Orthodox bishops do not impale their paternal coats with the see. They have none to impale. The Empire evolved some sort of rudimentary heraldry (it bore the spread-eagle sable in a field or), and under the Venetian Government some of the Corfiote families began to use arms. Quite lately, too, there has been a beginning of heraldry in the Balkan States (they have all taken arms) as part of the general imitation of Western manners. But the whole thing is really strange to Greeks and still more so to Arabs.

⁴ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ πάσης Κύπρου. The title of Justiniane is the curious relic of Justinian's attempt to transport the islanders to Thrace (p. 49).

that of bishop.¹ One does not often hear of an archbishop. The name occurs in the official title of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and in the case of one or two heads of autocephalous Churches. The title Exarch is also kept for a metropolitan who fills some exceptional and important position, as the Exarch of Georgia. So the Bulgars, not quite daring to call the head of their Church Patriarch, made him an Exarch. There is nothing corresponding to our Cathedral Chapters. All bishops are appointed by the Patriarch, Holy Synod, or other head of their Church. They must be celibates, and so are practically always chosen from the monasteries. They must be thirty years old, and are consecrated by the Patriarch or chief Metropolitan of their Church (or by their deputy) assisted by two other bishops.² The idea that to consecrate a bishop involves jurisdiction over him still prevails in the East. Metropolitans (and other bishops) are addressed as "Your Beatitude," they are "most Blessed Lords," and are spoken of as the "Holy man" of such a place. The title Despot (which in Greek has of course nothing of the bad associations of its English form) is often used too; the Turks usually speak of the bishop as the Despot Effendi.³ All bishops are exempt from the law which forbade Rayahs to ride a horse or to have followers. Their names are mentioned throughout their dioceses in the Holy Liturgy. They wear the usual dress of monks, a long black cassock and cloak with the invariable black kalemukion (brimless hat), and are only distinguished by the superior material of their clothes (the cloak is often fur-lined, &c.), the medal they wear round their neck, their veil, and the handsome ivory or silver-headed walking-stick they carry.⁴ The institution of the *Chorepiscopi* (χωρεπίσκοπος, Country Bishop) in the East has

¹ The Greek Church will gradually change this (p. 314). Ἀρχιερεὺς is a rather grandiloquent name for any bishop or abbot.

² In Turkey every bishop must receive his *berat* from the Government before he is consecrated.

³ Ὑμετέρα μακαριότης· Μακαριώτατος κύριος· Ὁ ἅγιος τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, τοῦ Κορίνθου κ.τ.λ. Δεσπότης.

⁴ They have no rings, and are very angry with our bishops for wearing them. This was one of Cerularius's complaints against us (p. 191).

For liturgical vestments see p. 405.

been the cause of much discussion. The Chorepiscopus is a person who takes rank between the town bishop (that is the bishop who has his see in some city) and the priest. The first time they are mentioned is at the Synod of Ancyra in 314. It is much discussed whether they had bishops' orders, so as to be auxiliary bishops, or whether they were priests with delegate authority over other priests, like rural deans. There seems evidence for both statements. It is possible that the office of Chorepiscopus was one that could and generally was held by a priest, although some of them may have been also ordained bishop, just as the provost of a chapter or rector of a church with us may be a bishop.¹ Chorepiscopi still exist in all the Eastern Churches. Among the Uniates I believe they never have bishops' orders. The Orthodox Chorepiscopus is generally bishop of a titular see, and then Chorepiscopus of some place within the real diocese. Thus Germanos Karavangelis, before he became Metropolitan of Kastoria, was bishop of some titular place (I forget what it was called) and Chorepiscopus of Pera. The secular clergy are educated at various seminaries and at the theological faculties of universities. The great seminary of the Byzantine Patriarchate is at Chalki, one of the Princes' Islands in the Sea of Marmora. It was founded in 1844, and last summer had eighty-three students.² There are other seminaries at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Janina, and Patmos. Alexandria has no seminary. Meletios of Antioch has just founded one at Balamand (near Tripolis in Syria), Jerusalem has two—the Holy Cross College for Greeks, just outside the city, and the college of the three Hierarchs³ inside, for Arabs. Russia has a famous "Spiritual Academy" at Petersburg,⁴ besides many other seminaries. The *Rizarion* at Athens is a large college of the same kind, and there were others at Syros,

¹ Cf. F. Gillmann: *Das Institut der Chorbischöfe im Orient*, Munich, 1903.

² For a description of this seminary see *E. d'Or.* viii. pp. 353-361, and Gelzer, *Geistl. u. Weltl.* pp. 46-48.

³ The three Hierarchs are SS. Basil, Gregory of Nazianz, and John Chrysostom.

⁴ W. Palmer visited it in 1840. See his *Visit to the Russian Church*, pp. 299-305.

Chalkis, Tripolis (in Greece), and Kerkyra.¹ The universities of Athens and Bucharest have theological faculties. Nevertheless, the Orthodox clergy has not the reputation of being a learned one.² In order that they may acquire more scholarship than can be procured at home, a number of students are now sent by their bishops to study at the German Protestant theological faculties; and Berlin, Leipzig, Jena, Halle, &c., are full of Greek students, who, with the versatility of their race, very soon learn to talk German perfectly, and to think and argue about theological questions like German higher critics. The disadvantage of the arrangement is that they generally take the rationalistic ideas they have learnt back with them. There is much more freethinking among the better educated Orthodox clergy than would be supposed.³ It is often said that Orthodox priests may marry. This is a mistake. The Sacrament of Holy Order is a diriment impediment to marriage with them, as with us. But if they are married before ordination, they may keep their wives; and this is what always happens among the secular clergy. They are appointed to parishes by the bishops, and live on small stipends paid by their parishioners and stole-fees. In Turkey a marriage costs from 5 to 10 piastres, a baptism 1 to 3 piastres, a funeral 3 to 5 piastres, a requiem about 5 piastres.⁴ Collections are made in churches on Sundays and holidays. A priest who has faculties to hear confessions is called a *Pneumatikos* (Ghostly Father); he must be forty years old, and he receives jurisdiction from the bishop specially. The Diaconate is a much more actual thing in the Orthodox Church than with us. It is not merely the last stepping-stone to the priesthood, but numbers of clerks remain deacons all their lives and help as curates in the parishes. Under the Diaconate there are four minor orders, those of the

¹ Kyriakos, iii. pp. 105, *seq.* These other schools have come to an end from being insufficiently attended.

² Kyriakos himself continually complains of this (*c.gr. l.c.*); but he is of the German Protestantizing school (he studied at Halle), who always speak scornfully of the clergy educated at home.

³ Brailsford, *Macedonia*, p. 193, tells of a metropolitan who avowed himself a freethinker. It is that impossible person Germanos Karavangelis.

⁴ Silbernagl, p. 42.

Subdeacon,¹ Reader, Exorcist, and Doorkeeper. Of course all priests have received these orders too. The secular clergy wear a cassock, cloak, and kalemaukion (priests have no veil over it). They have no tonsure, but wear long hair and a beard. To have their hair cut and be shaven is the mark of disgrace when they are suspended.

3. The Monks.

Monasticism is a very important feature of the Orthodox Church. In general it may be said that it has gone through none of the development that has gradually modified our idea of the religious life, and that it still represents the system that St. Basil knew in the East and St. Benedict found already existing in the West. Indeed, an Orthodox monastery is the most perfect relic of the 4th century left in the world.² We have different orders with various titles, rules, and objects: there are teaching orders, nursing orders, orders for doing the work of the secular clergy, orders for preaching to the poor, orders for saving the rich. And with us a religious is either a monk, or a friar, or a canon regular, &c.; they have various letters after their names, honour different holy founders, and obey different rules. The Orthodox monk understands nothing of all this. He belongs to no special order, has no letters after his name, and he would indignantly declare that the only founder of his order is our Lord himself. If one were to ask him what he does—whether he teaches, nurses, preaches, or hears confessions—he would explain that these things are done by people in the world; he is a monk. They still have the ideal of the religious life as meaning only one thing, to flee the world. It is that of the fathers of the desert. One would describe them as being all contemplative, except that they never contemplate. That, too, is a Latin innovation. They say enormous quantities of vocal prayers, sing endless

¹ The Subdiaconate has always been a minor order in the East.

² Harnack: *Das Mönchtum, Seine Ideale u. Seine Geschichte* (Giessen, 1880, also printed in his *Reden u. Aufsätze*, Giessen, 1904, i. pp. 81-139) is a very illuminating study of the gradual development of the ideal of a religious order in the West.

psalms, fast incredibly ; and that is all. Most of them are not priests, and those that are never have the care of souls outside their monastery. That is the business of the bishops and secular clergy. They are monks who have left all that. And they have no distinctions of orders. A monk is just a monk and needs no other name. They all follow the rule of St. Basil,¹ but they are indignant if one calls them Basilians. They do not belong to St. Basil's order, they explain, but St. Basil belonged to theirs. And the object of their life is to be like the Angels ; it is the "Angelic life," and their habit is the "Angelic dress." Each monastery (λαῦρα) is independent of all the others—they have no generals, nor provincials. Most lauras, however, are under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan ; a few of the greatest are immediately subject to the Patriarch and are called *Stauropegia* (σταυροπήγιον).² Many lauras have daughter-houses subject to their abbot ; such a house is called *Kellion* (κελλίον) or *Kalyba* (καλύβα), and they are sometimes grouped in a sort of village called a *Sketa* (σκήτα).³ The head of a laura (abbot) is the *Hegumenos* (ηγούμενος, leader).⁴ He is appointed by the Metropolitan (or Patriarch), after having been elected by the monks, is blessed and enthroned by the same Metropolitan, while the monks cry "Worthy" (ἄξιος) ; and he then rules for life, unless he be deposed for very scandalous conduct. A Hegumenos is absolute master of his laura and its kellia ; but he must govern according to the Canons and St. Basil's rule, and he is generally assisted by a parliament of the elder monks (the Synaxis). The

¹ There are a few monasteries that still follow an older rule, called that of St. Antony. Mount Sinai does so, as well as some on Lebanon and by the Red Sea (Silbernagl, p. 46).

² One laura, Mount Sinai, as we have seen, is independent even of any Patriarch.

³ This is a shortened form of ἀσκητήρια, ἄσκητα. Such a group or village of monks' houses is united by the one church used by all.

⁴ The Hegumenos of a specially important laura is called an *Archimandrite* —ἀρχιμανδρίτης, ἄρχων τῆς μάνδρας. Μάνδρα means hurdle, then sheepfold. The name begins about the 5th century. It has often been used as synonymous with ἡγούμενος, and also occurs in the Latin Church (cf. Ducange, s.v.). Silbernagl is wrong in thinking that every priest-monk is an archimandrite (p. 46). Cf. Cabrol : *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (Paris, 1906, in course of publication), s.v., col. 2,739, seq.

head of a kellion under the Hegumenos is the *Geron*, the head of a *Sketa*, the *Dikaïos*. The present Canon Law orders that any one who wishes to be a monk shall first obey the rule for three years in lay dress (as a novice). This time may, however, be shortened in the case of older men who show great piety and gravity. After the noviceship, the monk receives the first habit, a cassock, leather belt, and *kalemaukion*. He is now a *beginner* (*ἀρχάριος*), and wears a large tonsure with long hair and a beard. After about two more years he makes solemn vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and receives a short cloak, the *mandyas* (*μανδύας*). After some years more, he at last has the complete angelic dress, a great cloak (*κουκύνλιον*) marked with five crosses, and a scapular (*ἀνάλαβας*). Most monks have no orders; they form the usual class, and are called simply monks (*μόναχοι*), some are ordained deacon and some priests, who then become priest-monks (*ιερομόναχοι*). The common people, however, call all of them of any age or rank "good old men" (*καλόγεροι*), and "good old man" is the usual name for a monk all over the East.¹ All monks sing the whole of their enormously long office every day in choir, and this takes up the great part of the day;² on the eve of great feasts they spend the whole night in their church, too, keeping the vigil with the office of the *night-watch* (*ὀλονυκτικόν*).³ The rest of the time they rest from the labour of saying the office, sleep, dig in the garden, or do work for the monastery. The Athos monks seem to spend a good deal of time rowing boats. Although there are no different religious orders, there are two very different kinds of monastery. The stricter monasteries are *Cænobia* (*κοινόβια*). In these, the monks possess nothing at all, live and eat together and have definite tasks appointed to them by their superiors. But there are also many *Idiorythmic* monasteries (*ιδιόρυθμα*) in which the monks live entirely apart from one

¹ The Turks have taken the word into their language.

² Rather more than eight hours. They divide the twenty-four hours of the day into three parts—eight hours for the office, eight for hand work, eight for food, sleep, and recreation. That is the theory. Really, except on great feasts, they chant the office very fast and get through it in about six hours altogether.

³ Also called *agrypnia*.

another. Each receives from the monastery fuel, wine, vegetables, cheese, and about £2 or £3 a year. The rest he must earn for himself. They only meet for the Divine Office and on great feasts for dinner. Otherwise they do what they like. But their lives are quite simple, poor, and edifying.

Besides the monasteries there are a few hermits who live entirely alone, chiefly in Macedonia.¹ Monasteries are spread all over the Orthodox world. The Meteora lauras in Thessaly, perched on the top of crags to which one is hauled up in a basket, are famous; Sveti Naum, on Lake Ochrida, has been much discussed lately as a forepost of Hellenism in Macedonia,² Jerusalem has ten Orthodox monasteries, Cyprus fourteen, Russia four hundred,³ &c. We have already spoken of Mount Sinai (p. 310). But the most famous of all, and one of the great centres of the Orthodox Church, is the monastic republic on the *Holy Mountain*, Athos. Mount Athos is at the end of the northernmost of the three peninsulas that jut out from Chalcis. The whole peninsula is a colony of monasteries; even the Turks call it *Ayon Oros* (τὸ ἄγιον ὄρος). In the 10th century a certain St. Athanasius built a great laura here; ⁴ gradually others were founded round it, and now there are twenty lauras, which have many more kellia and sketai under them. All these lauras are stauropegia—no bishop but the Œcumenical Patriarch has any jurisdiction on the Holy Mountain—and all but one are "Imperial lauras." When the Turk came he allowed autonomy and special privileges to the monks' republic, and in this case he has honourably kept his word. The result is that the only Rayahs who ever speak well of the Sultan are the Athos monks.⁵ The most important of these

¹ For monastic life in the Orthodox Church see Silbernagl, pp. 43-60, and the books on Mount Athos quoted, p. xxv.

² Cf. Gelzer: *Vom hlgen Berge*, u.s.w., pp. 189-201.

³ The three greatest lauras in Russia are the Holy Trinity at Moscow, St. Alexander at Petersburg, and the Holy Wisdom at Kiev. Mr. Palmer spent some time at the Moscow laura (*Visit*, &c., pp. 183-220).

⁴ There are wonderful legends about Athos, tracing the foundations back to St. Constantine, the "equal of the Apostles," and telling of endless apparitions and miracles (Gelzer, *o.c.* pp. 10-14). See also the real history (pp. 14-28).

⁵ All Mohammedans have a great respect for any sort of ascetic, holy man or monk. They, too, know what *fakirs* are.

twenty luras are the great lura of St. Athanasius (Greek), the enormous Russian Panteleïmon (Russiko), the old Georgian monastery of the Falling Asleep of the Mother of God (Ivion, now Greek), Vatopedi, Esfigmenu, Zografu, &c.¹ Each is governed by its own Hegumenos, and no one has authority over another, though many have dependent kellia,² which, of course, obey their mother-house. Some luras are Cœnobic and others Idiorythmic. But there is a general administration for the whole commonwealth chosen in this way. Each monastery sends one deputy and one assistant-deputy to Karyaes, in the middle of the peninsula. The twenty deputies are divided into five groups of four each, and each group takes it in turn to preside over the whole colony. They have no authority over the internal arrangements of each lura, but they have to judge between them in disputes and represent the whole in exterior affairs, that is with the Porte and the Phanar. A Turkish Aga³ also lives at Karyaes. The Government of Athos keeps a representative at the Phanar and at Salonike. The various luras have metochia⁴ all over Macedonia, and even as far off as Tiflis and Moscow. The Metropolitan of Heraclea comes to hold ordinations, but always as the guest of the Hegumenos of each lura, and on the distinct understanding that he has no jurisdiction. The monks are exceedingly hospitable to guests, but the guests must be men. One of the strictest of all laws here is that no woman, nor even any sort of female animal, may ever set foot on the Holy Mountain. The Aga during his time of office has to live in unwilling celibacy. In 1902 there were 7,522 monks at Athos—3,615 Russians, 3,207 Greeks, 340 Bulgars, 288 Vlachs, 53 Georgians, and 18 Serbs. Unhappily the international quarrels that rend all the Orthodox Church flourish exceedingly on the Holy Mountain. Here, too, Greek, Bulgar, Vlach, and Serb hate and persecute

¹ The complete list in Gelzer, *o.c.* pp. 28–29 ; Silbernagl, pp. 53–54.

² There are 290 kellia and 11 sketai at Athos.

³ An Aga is a small sort of governor.

⁴ A *metochion* is a daughter-house or farm a long way off, administered by monks sent from the lura. It differs from a kellion in being a source of revenue to the parent-house.

each other. And here, too, of course, Russia is the common enemy. Formerly the Greeks had managed to drive out nearly all the other elements. They had seized and Hellenized Iviron (the Georgian laura), the Russian Panteleïmon, and the Bulgarian monasteries Philotheu, Xenophontos, and St. Paul. But now those days are over, and at Athos, as everywhere, the Russians are eating everything up. They are already the majority. Since the Phanar will not let them have any other laura besides Panteleïmon, they have made that enormously big, and have founded kellia and sketai all over the peninsula, dependent on Panteleïmon, but really larger and richer than many lauras. And so on the Holy Mountain, too, the traveller hears chiefly one endless wail of the Orthodox against each other.¹ This centre of monasticism has specially set its face against any degradation of the monastic ideal into a life of study. Eugenios Bulgaris (p. 250) tried to found a school to teach the monks something of scholarship. Indignantly they tore it down ; it still stands a ruin and a warning that the Angelic life has nothing to do with such vanities as knowledge, even of theology. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. But not every stranger is edified by a scorn for knowledge which is most certainly not caused by great zeal for charity. The Protestant Professor Gelzer, who is exceedingly well disposed towards the Orthodox Church, has this to say about it : " While the Catholic Orders as teaching or nursing bodies have become an important element in the civilization of the 19th century, what have Athos, Sinai, Patmos, or Megaspilaion been doing ? The Greeks often bitterly complain of the mighty progress of the Catholic Propaganda ; but they must themselves own that the best schools and hospitals in Turkey belong to the Catholic Orders. . . . It is no good scolding and complaining. If the monks, like their Western brethren, would work for the education and social improvement of their people, then the monasteries would have a real reason for their existence. . . . The more cultured people, who are full of Western ideas, look on

¹ About Mount Athos cf. Gelzer : *Vom hlgen Berge*, part I. *Ech. d'Or.* iv. *La vie cénobitique à l'Athos*, pp. 80-87, 145-153 ; *Les monastères idiorrhythmes de l'Athos*, pp. 288-295.

monks with scorn, even with hatred, and the unlimited reverence that simple folk once had for the 'good old man' is visibly disappearing. Nothing can put off the ruin of monasticism except a great moral revival which would make an imitation of the splendid Catholic example possible. . . . And it cannot be said that this is opposed to the spirit of Eastern religious life. The Mechitarists, who are united to Rome but true sons of Armenia, have for a long time kept flourishing schools both at Constantinople and in the provinces."¹ Of course, the Orthodox monk would answer all this by saying that neither the Protestant professor nor the Catholic Frati are capable of understanding the Angelic life. The Orthodox Church has also convents of nuns whose rule and manner of life correspond to that of the monks. The Abbess is called *ἡ ἡγουμένησσα*.

Summary.

At the head of the Orthodox hierarchy stands the Œcumenical Patriarch. Although still the official chief of the Roman nation, he has now no longer any civil jurisdiction. He is assisted by a synod of his bishops and by a mixed council, and these two bodies elect the Patriarch when the see is vacant. The old abuse of continually deposing patriarchs still flourishes exceedingly. All bishops are celibates, and most are now titular metropolitans. The secular clergy are married before ordination, and they keep their wives. There are, however, very many celibate monks and nuns, and the East is covered with Orthodox monasteries, of which the most important are the twenty lauras with their dependent houses that make up the commonwealth of monks on Mount Athos.

¹ *Geistl. u. Weltl.* pp. 93-95. See the whole chapter, "Catholic Orders a Model for Greek Monks."

CHAPTER XII

THE ORTHODOX FAITH

THE faith of the Orthodox Church agrees in the enormous majority of points with that of Catholics. In order not to fill up this chapter with an exposition of what we learnt in our catechisms, we will notice only the differences. But a list of such differences is liable to falsify one's sense of proportion. In considering what they believe it would be absurd to think of the procession of the Holy Ghost, the questions of the Epiklesis, Purgatory, the Primacy, as the chief points. The foundations of the Orthodox faith are belief in one God in three Persons, in the Incarnation of God the Son, Redemption by the Sacrifice of his life, the Church founded by him with her Sacraments, the Resurrection of the body, and Life everlasting. Let it then be said at once that the pious Orthodox layman lives in the same religious atmosphere as we do. His Church stands in every way nearer to the Catholic Church than any other religious body. The Orthodox use the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, and understand every word of them (but for one fatal clause in the latter) just as we do. But these are only what we may call the œcumenical Christian ideas.¹ The same could be said of Trinitarian Protestants. It is in the points about which Protestants disagree that we see how near the Orthodox Church is to us. The Orthodox believe in a visible Church with authority to declare the true faith and to make laws. They have a hierarchy against which our only complaint is that it has

¹ It is Harnack's expression.

lost the topmost branch ; they accept the Deuterocanonical books of Scripture as equal to the others, they believe in and use the same seven Sacraments as we do, they honour and pray to Saints, have a great cult of holy pictures and relics, and look with unbounded reverence towards the all-holy Mother of God. Their sumptuous ritual, gorgeous vestments and elaborate ceremonies, their blessings and sacramentals, all make their Church seem what she so easily might once more become—the honoured sister of the great Latin Patriarchate. It is only when one examines the niceties of theology that one finds four or five points in which they are heretics, and of these most are doubtful. Both sides in this quarrel recognize that the real issue is one rather of schism than of heresy. Whereas the Protestant Reformation produced schisms because of its heresies, the issue between East and West has produced some heresies because of the schism. The chief points we have to consider are the questions of the Church and Primacy, of the Filioque, Transubstantiation and the Epiklesis, Purgatory, and the Immaculate Conception. But first we must see in what books they have declared their faith.

1. Orthodox Symbolic Books.

The Orthodox faith is contained first of all in the Apostles' Creed and in the Nicene Creed (of course without the Filioque).¹ Then in the decrees of the seven councils that they acknowledge as œcumenical, that is the first seven.² They insist very much

¹ They print a Greek translation of the Athanasian Creed in the Horologion (without the Filioque), but they do not ever say it liturgically.

² 1. Nicea (325) ; 2. Constantinople I (381) ; 3. Ephesus (431) ; 4. Chalcedon (451) ; 5. Constantinople II (553) ; 6. Constantinople III (681) ; 7. Nicea II (787). Although they still sometimes speak of their Photian Synod of 879 as the eighth general council, they always refer only to the first seven. It is one of the points in which they are inconsistent, and seem to acknowledge the consent of the West and its Patriarch as necessary for an entirely general council. They might just as well require the consent of the Nestorian and Monophysite bodies (since we, too, are heretics and schismatics), and this would leave only the first two. They also sometimes speak of general councils in quite another sense. Kyriakos calls the Vatican Council an "œcumenical Synod of the Latin Church." Many of them are anxious to summon a great council now to settle their difficulties. If it does meet, will

on their conservatism, and eagerly maintain that they and they alone still hold the faith of the seven councils unchanged and entire. That and that alone is the faith of the Orthodox. "Our Church knows no developments," as a Russian archimandrite told Mr. Palmer. For all that, since the meaning of many decrees of the seven councils is a matter of discussion (Latins see in some of them quite plain acknowledgement of the Pope's primacy), and since there certainly are points which these councils have not explicitly defined (they say nothing about seven Sacraments, nor the Epiklesis, for instance), the Orthodox have been just as much obliged as every one else to draw up more modern forms declaring quite plainly how they understand the old faith and establishing their position in regard to later controversies. And this already involves development.

The symbolical documents of the Orthodox Church¹ are these : 1. The *Confession of Gennadios*. This is Gennadios Scholarios, who was a determined enemy of the Florentine Union, and who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 1453 (p. 241). Sultan Mohammed II, who was well disposed towards him, asked for an account of the faith of his Church. In answer he drew up a "Confession of the true and genuine faith of Christians" in twenty paragraphs.² It was translated into Turkish by Ahmed, Kadi of Berrhœa, and has been continually reprinted and edited since. Gennadios's Confession has traces of the Platonic

it be only an "Œcumenical Synod of the Eastern Church," or as universal as the first seven? According to their own claims and profession they should say the latter. As they feel no great need of being consistent and have a sort of shyness about saying quite plainly that the whole of the enormous Catholic body is a negligible institution, they will probably say the former. It is curious that an accident of fate has given the Orthodox one more example of the holy number. They have not only seven Sacraments, seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, seven deadly sins, and seven days in the week, but seven general councils, dimly foretold long ages ago by the seven-branched candlestick.

¹ They will be found in Greek and Latin in Kimmel: *Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis*, and in Greek in Michalcescu: *Die Bekenntnisse . . . der griech.-orient. Kirche*.

² Kimmel, i. pp. 11-23; Michalcescu, pp. 17-21. Kimmel also prints a probably unauthentic *Dialogue between Gennadios and Mohammed II*, i. pp. 1-10.

philosophy he favoured (God is the "Demiurgos" of all things, there are three "Idiomata" in God), and he avoids calling the three Persons "Prosopa," possibly so as not to shock the Mohammedan. 2. The next document is the *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogilas (p. 250). It was translated from Latin into Greek, accepted by the Patriarchs and the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, and is published with prefaces by Nektarios of Jerusalem and Parthenios of Constantinople.¹ This "Orthodox Confession of the faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church" is a very long document in three parts, drawn up as a catechism in the form of question and answer. The first part (one hundred and twenty-six questions and answers) goes through the Nicene Creed, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, the commandments of the Church, and the seven Sacraments; the second part (sixty-three) speaks of prayer, the Our Father and the Beatitudes; the third part (seventy-two) discusses good works, different kinds of sin, the ten commandments, worship of Saints, relics and holy pictures. This Confession, having been accepted and promulgated by the Synod of Jerusalem, may be considered as part of its Acts. However, when that synod is quoted, the other Acts, in two parts, are meant. The first part contains the rejection of all Cyril Lukaris's protestantizing ideas and a long argument to prove that he did not really write his Confession. The second part, or appendix, is (3) the *Confession of Dosiltheos* (Nektarios's successor at Jerusalem), consisting of eighteen decrees and four questions and answers, each drawn up in opposition to the eighteen decrees and four questions of Lukaris's Confession.² 4. The *Confession of Metrophanes Kritopulos*, Patriarch of Alexandria († 1641, p. 250), is the last of these symbolic books. It is, however, only a private confession that has not been officially recognized by the other Patriarchs, and so it has less authority than that of Mogilas. It is also slightly influenced by Protestant theology.³

¹ Kimmel, i. pp. 45-324; Michalcescu, pp. 26-122.

² Kimmel, i. pp. 325-487; Michalcescu, pp. 126-182. The history of the Synod of Jerusalem above (p. 267).

³ Kritopulos was sent by Lukaris to England to bring the Codex Alexandrinus to Charles I. He was a friend of Lukaris and studied at Protestant

But it is quoted by the Orthodox and printed in collections of their symbolic works.¹ It consists of twenty-two chapters arranged in no order, in which he discusses not only the faith but such customs as praying towards the East (chap. 21), and not kneeling on Sundays and during Pentecost (chap. 22). The last part, "of the state of the Eastern Church," is made into a separate chapter (23) by Kimmel and Michalcescu. It is a short summary of their Canon Law. Kritopulos makes a speciality of arguments against the procession of the Holy Ghost from both Persons; he divides the Sacraments into two classes, of which only the first class (Baptism, Holy Eucharist, Penance) are strictly Sacraments.² His division of "simple" and "economical" theology³ is curious and is part of his protestantizing tendency. He is very much opposed to the Latins. Besides these Confessions the liturgical books of the Orthodox Church contain prayers and declarations from which its faith may be deduced.⁴ These are the sources to which one must refer for a genuine interpretation of their beliefs.

2. The Church and the Primacy.

The Orthodox, of course, believe that Christ our Lord founded one Church only, of which all his followers should be members. It is of this Church that they understand the texts about the Kingdom of Heaven, and they acknowledge in her the triple authority of teaching, ruling, and sanctifying. And this Church is absolutely and exclusively their own communion. Every one who is outside that communion is a schismatic; every one who denies any part of its faith is a heretic. Nothing can be clearer than this in their formulas, prayers, and declarations. It is the faith of their official documents, and it is the consciousness of all their people. They continually

universities—Oxford, Wittenberg, Tübingen, &c. But he took part in the Synod of Constantinople in 1638 against Lukaris. Cf. Michalcescu, pp. 183-186, who quotes the protestantizing clauses in his Confession.

¹ Kimmel, ii. pp. 1-213; Michalcescu, pp. 186-252.

² Chap. 5, Michalcescu, p. 214.

³ Chap. I, Michalcescu, p. 187.

⁴ A collection of such prayers, &c., is printed as an appendix to Michalcescu's *Bekenntnisse*, pp. 277-314.

speak of the different branches of the Church, but they mean the sixteen bodies who are in communion with one another, and who together make up the Orthodox Church. The idea of a Church made up of mutually excommunicate bodies that teach different articles of faith and yet altogether form one Church is as inconceivable to them as it is to us.¹ In this matter from their point of view they hold the same position as we do. Schism means exclusion from the visible Church of Christ; all members of that Church are in communion with one another; she teaches one and the same faith everywhere, and is, in short, really one Church. The issue between us and them is, Which body is the Church of Christ, ours or theirs?

They have forms for receiving Latins into their Church² in which these expressions occur: "Lord, mercifully receive thy servant N. who abandons the heresy of the Latins . . . bring him to the unity of the true teaching of thy Catholic and Apostolic Church." The priest thanks God for having given the convert grace "to seek the refuge of thy holy Catholic

¹ The Branch theory, of which we hear so much in England, is really common to all Protestants. Every Protestant sect considers itself to be, not the whole, but a part, of the universal Church of Christ, though, of course, always the purest and most apostolic part. The only thing peculiar to the Anglican form of this theory is the exclusiveness with which they admit no other Protestant bodies as branches except their own. In the East especially it is very difficult, with the best intention, to find out what they mean by their theory. Which are the branches. Are valid orders the test? Then the Nestorian and Monophysite bodies are branches? The Archbishop of Canterbury's mission to the Nestorians and the civility of Anglicans to the Armenians would seem as if they thought so. In that case three of the four Orthodox Patriarchs (those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) are as much schismatics as Roman Catholic bishops in England. But probably most Anglicans would say that Nestorians and Monophysites are not Catholics because they are heretics condemned by general councils. To which they would answer that Ephesus and Chalcedon were not general councils. They no more acknowledge them (the Nestorians neither, the Monophysites not Chalcedon) than Anglicans acknowledge Trent or Vatican. Mr. Palmer went to Russia with the simplest of theories: the Church consists of three branches—the Eastern (presumably he meant only the Orthodox) and the Western, subdivided into the Continental and the British (*e.gr. Visit*, p. 174). Of course every one asked him: Why three, and why those three? How entirely they all denied this theory may be seen throughout the book.

² *E. d'Or.* ii. pp. 129–138. The later one is imitated from the form drawn up by Pope Gregory XV for receiving them into the Catholic Church,

Orthodox Church"; he formally absolves him from schism and heresy after having made him say that he desires union with the "holy, Catholic, Orthodox, Eastern Church." The Confessions of Mogilas and Kritopulos say the same thing less directly.¹ D. Bernadakes wrote the Catechism used in their schools throughout Turkey and Greece. In it he explains the four notes of the Church, that she is one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic, and establishes that these are the notes of the Orthodox Church only. The child is made to exclude explicitly the Roman and Protestant Churches.² And this is the conviction of all the Orthodox. Palmer's *Visit to the Russian Church* is full of conversations in which the author elaborately expounded his new Branch theory to bishops, archimandrites, priests, to the Procurator of the Holy Synod, even to noble ladies. And all, without exception, answer that they have never heard of it before, and that it is absolutely opposed to the teaching of their Church. Long ago St. Metrophanes of Voronege († 1703, canonized 1832), one of the famous Russian Saints, had left as a legacy to his people a last address in which he says: "As without faith it is impossible to please God, so also without the Holy Eastern Church and her divinely-delivered doctrine it is impossible to be saved."³ So the Archimandrite of the laura at Moscow: "Our Church is in truth the whole Orthodox Catholic Church, and she calls herself so distinctly."⁴ The Archpriest Koutnevich, "High Almoner of the Army and Fleet," says: "We are unbending concerning the Eastern Church, which we believe to be altogether right, while all others have fallen away." He goes on to say that "Rome and the Latin Church has all Christianity, only deformed by one or two heresies."⁵ The Procurator of the Holy Synod, Count Pratasov, "seemed to be staggered at the idea of one visible Catholic Church being made up of three communions, differing in doctrine and rites, and two of them at

¹ Mogilas makes union with the (Orthodox) See of Jerusalem, "mother and mistress of all Churches," the condition (i. qu. 84). Kritopulos says there are four Patriarchs of the universal Church—they are, of course, the four Orthodox ones (chap. xxiii. ; see also chap. vii.).

² Quoted in Kattenbusch: *Orient. Kirche*, in the *Realenz.* xiv. p. 456.

³ Palmer's *Visit*, p. 95.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 196.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 268.

least condemning and anathematizing the others.”¹ One can understand the Count’s astonishment. We have seen, too, how the Russian Holy Synod quite lately again insisted that the Orthodox Communion is the “one and only heir of Christ, and the only ark of salvation” (p. 347). In short, in spite of all kindly and pious hopes for reunion with other Christians (such as Catholics also express), in spite of their courtesy and hospitality to guests of other Churches (this, too, will be found in countless Catholic monasteries), the Orthodox are quite as definitely committed to the belief that their Church is the only true one as Catholics are on their side.² The reunion of Christendom means to the Orthodox simply the conversion of other Christians to their Church. Latins and Protestants are not only schismatics but also heretics. They call us so continually. The Filioque alone is a black and soul-destroying heresy, so are Papal Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception, and so on. And although these Eastern people are not remarkable for the consistency of their ideas, they have never let the confusion become so great as to believe that a body publicly and officially committed to heresy can be a branch of the true Church. And yet there are points that seem to contradict this. Why, for instance, if they believe themselves to be the only true Church, have they never sent missionaries to convert us ;³ why have they set up no real Orthodox bishops instead of the Latin heretics who occupy the Western sees, although (as we shall see) they are doubtfully baptized, have doubtful orders, and a doubtful Eucharist? And why do the Orthodox count only seven general councils? If they are the whole Church, why cannot they hold a general council that shall be as legitimate as Nicæa?

The first question can be easily answered. In any case, it proves nothing. Till the Russians began their missions the Orthodox sent no missionaries anywhere. They did not try to

¹ Palmer’s *Visit*, p. 278. See also pp. 160, *seq.*, 176, *seq.*, 248, *seq.*, &c., &c.

² Ingenuous Anglicans admit this. “The Eastern Church professes to be the only true Church, both Catholic and Orthodox” (A. C. Headlam: *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, p. 1).

³ Mr. Palmer continually urged this point to the Russians and with great effect (*Visit*, p. 249, &c.).

convert any one—heathen, Mohammedan, or Christian. Nor can one blame them for that. At the very beginning of the schism they hardly understood what had happened. Then they hoped rather to convert the Latins in a body by some such council as Florence. Then came the Turks, and they had other things to think of than converting unbelievers. During those dark centuries one could hardly ask the Orthodox to do more than to keep the faith themselves. One can never forget that they did this heroically. And now, in spite of their indignation against propaganda, they do send out Orthodox priests and bishops, even to the West. It is true that these priests chiefly have to look after the Orthodox communities in Paris, London, Berlin, and so on; but they are always ready and glad to receive any converts to the Orthodox faith. There are well-known cases of Catholics and Anglicans being received (generally even re-baptized) by the Orthodox. Nor have they any confused ideas about a Latin being a schismatic in Constantinople, but a true Catholic at Rome. These conversions take place at Paris, in England, and in America. Let anyone go to the nearest Orthodox Protopope or Archimandrite, and ask what he should do to serve Christ and God. There will be no question but that the answer will be: "Join the Orthodox Church," and the Protopope will gladly instruct and receive him, just as a Catholic priest would. That they have not organized missions to us, and that they take so little trouble to convert us, only shows that they have not such means at their disposal as the Roman Propaganda, and that they have not the zealous missionary spirit of the Catholic Church. But that they are so angry with our missionary friars in the East is absurd. These friars are doing from their point of view exactly what the Orthodox do in the West from theirs, only, being Catholics and Westerns, they are doing it more consistently, zealously, and efficiently. As for the lack of a general council since the schism, it is true they have held none—they have hardly had an opportunity. But it does not follow that they think themselves incapable of so doing. I have no evidence either way, but unless they are quite unusually inconsistent in this matter, they must hold that they could summon a general council now that would be as truly œcumeni-

cal as the first seven. True, the Latins would not attend, but there have always been heretics who stayed away from such councils, nor can their heresy and schism mutilate the true Church of her most important power and right. True, also, that, of the five thrones, one, and the first of them, would be empty, because its occupier has fallen away. But at Chalcedon Dioscur of Alexandria appeared only as a culprit to be judged. There seems, then, to be no conceivable reason why the Œcumenical Synod about which they are now talking—if it ever meets—should not be the equal of the old ones. Pity that it will spoil the holy number, seven, and rob the seven-branched candlestick of its prophetic symbolism.

With regard to the Primacy, all the Orthodox, of course, indignantly deny that the Bishop of Rome has any sort of authority over the whole Church. They continually repeat that the Head of the Church is not the Pope, but Christ our Lord.¹ If this is meant as an argument, it leaves things exactly as they were. Christ our Lord is presumably the Head of each local Church, each diocese, province, and patriarchate too. Yet he has visible vicars who rule in his name—patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops. Is he not the Head of the new national Churches, too—of the Churches of Russia, Greece, Roumania? Yet here the highest law-giving authority rests with a Holy Synod which uses jurisdiction that can only come from our Lord. If our Lord, in spite of the fact that (as we all believe) he, and he only, is the Head of the Church,² has vicars who rule in his name over local Churches and great patriarchates, there is no difficulty (from this consideration) in admitting that his vicars may have a head vicar set over them, as they are set over the faithful and over subordinate vicars.³ However, they all make much of this point, triumphantly quote such texts as

¹ *Mogilas*, i. qu. 85; *Kritopulos*, chap. xxiii. (*Kimmel*, p. 210, *Michalcescu*, p. 251), &c.

² Every Catholic has learnt this in his Catechism. See, for instance, the English Catechism, Q. 85: "Who is the Head of the Catholic Church? A. The Head of the Catholic Church is Jesus Christ our Lord."

³ The bishop is vicar of Christ over his flock, the metropolitan over bishops, the patriarch over metropolitans. But the Orthodox theologian sees an inherent impossibility in there being a vicar over patriarchs.

Eph. v. 23 ("Christ is the Head of the Church") against us, and persist in representing our difference in the monstrous and libellous form that Catholics believe the Pope to be the Head of the Church, whereas the Orthodox say that it is Christ. And in rejecting the Roman Primacy, as we have seen (chap. ii.), they have forsaken the faith of their fathers. Their theologians, however, still hold to the not very old ideal of a Pentarchy. There should be five Patriarchs set over the Church universal, five Vicars of Christ for the whole Church. But this Pentarchy has been now ruthlessly lacerated. One Patriarch has altogether fallen away, and has become a prince of heresies. And, even among the faithful four, developments have happened that the seven councils never foresaw. Although the Orthodox are the Church that knows no change, the Fathers of the second Nicene Synod would greatly wonder at their organization now. Three Patriarchs are shadows, and there are nine national Churches cut away from the other. The overwhelming majority of the Orthodox obey no Patriarch at all. The conservative theologian would desire as an ideal, first, the conversion of the Roman Patriarch to Orthodoxy and the rejection of his arrogant claims; secondly, the restoration of Russia, Greece, Bulgaria, Roumania, &c., to the obedience of Constantinople. One hope is about as likely to be fulfilled as the other. But if that did happen, the Roman Patriarch would again take his place as the first of all bishops. His authority would stretch over all the West, but he would have no jurisdiction in the East. Second and almost equal to him in honour would come the Œcumenical Patriarch, ruling over vast lands, then the Pontiffs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and, lastly, the Church of Cyprus. How little this ideal really answers to primitive conditions we have seen in the history of the development of the patriarchates. If the Orthodox really want to go back to the state of the early Church, they must acknowledge the Roman Patriarch as supreme Pontiff everywhere and Patriarch of the West, then the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and that is all. Constantinople and Jerusalem would be nowhere. But in this case, as always, what they mean by antiquity is development up to a certain point, and then an arbitrary full stop. Meanwhile, their

misfortune is that, whereas they can, and do, absolutely refuse to acknowledge our claims, they cannot help acknowledging such changes as these new national Churches, which really are opposed to the organization left by their seven councils. The Roman Patriarch, then, *if he repented*, would have a sort of primacy of honour, as well as real jurisdiction over his own Western lands. As it is at present, he has nothing. He is the head of a heretical Church, no more to be taken into account than the Armenian, Coptic, or Jacobite Patriarchs.¹ It is only if he turns Orthodox that he may again be counted in the Pentarchy, and then, indeed, there would be joy among the angels, for the lost star would be restored to the Orthodox firmament.

3. The Filioque.

The Filioque is still the great shibboleth. This is the most noxious of Latin heresies ; one shudders to think what rivers of ink have flowed because of this question since Photius's happy thought of making this grievance against us. Nevertheless we must now say something about it. The accusation against us is twofold, first, that we believe and teach heresy on this point; secondly, that we have tampered with the Creed by inserting the word, and have thereby incurred the anathema pronounced by the Council of Ephesus. When looking back on this long and bitter controversy one realizes most of all that the question, one way or the other, has never yet affected the piety or the practical faith of any human being. We all adore one God in three Persons, we all worship the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Lifegiver, who with the Father and Son is adored and glorified. Has any one ever, when praying to the great Spirit of God, stopped to consider and to be influenced by so high and dark a

¹ At least, that would be the consistent theory. But it is always hopeless to look for consistency in Orthodox theology. They have never attempted to let up a rival Orthodox Roman Patriarch (the position of such a person with regard to Constantinople is a fascinating speculation), as they have rival Patriarchs in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, and generally they practically acknowledge the Pope as head of the Western Church and legitimate first Patriarch, and they really only complain of his universal claim.

mystery as whether he proceeds from both Persons or only from God the Father? And, secondly, the question is still, as always, the accusation of the Orthodox against Catholics, not ours against them. They greedily found this charge, and they have never ceased clamouring about it as if it were the root of the whole Christian faith. True, two of our councils (Lyons II and Florence) defined the Filioque, though with every possible moderation and tolerance towards their view; but that was only after they had talked about it, and anathematized us for centuries. Even now Rome has never asked them to say the words in their Creed, the Uniates do not do so, although, of course, every Catholic must believe what was defined at Florence. It is they who cannot forgive us for saying it in our Creed. A question, first raked up simply as a convenient weapon against the Pope, has loomed so large to them that they really seem to think it the chief point of the faith. Let any one look at the confessions and documents they have drawn up since the schism and count the pages devoted to this question alone. And they all know about it. Schoolboys learn at the very beginning of their catechism about the horrible heresy of the Latins on this point. Greek officers, boatmen, porters, are not distinguished for theological scholarship, but they all know that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone. The young men at Athens, who have dabbled in higher criticism and Darwinism, are shaky about many points of the Christian faith, but on one point they never swerve: the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son. Mr. Skarlatos Byzantios has composed a very useful Greek-French lexicon.¹ When he comes to the preposition ἐξ, one example of its use at once occurs to him, and he illustrates the fact that it takes the genitive by this sentence: Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς which he proceeds to translate for the Western student by informing him, "le Saint-Esprit procède du Père seul." At any rate the Catholic Church has kept a righter sense of proportion. We do not teach our children much about this question. When its place comes in the treatise *de Deo trino* our theologians learn what has to be said about it, but in sermons

¹ Athens, 1888,

and catechism and certainly in dictionaries we have other things to discuss. With regard to the first point, the doctrine itself, we should note that the difference is not so great as is commonly supposed and that the whole question at issue is not so entirely arbitrary, the opposed assertions are not really such wanton statements about the unknowable as the non-theologian would think. It will be as well to begin by explaining what the "procession of the Holy Ghost" means. God the Father is the source of the Divine nature. The other Divine Persons receive this same nature from him. God the Son receives it by generation: he is born of the Father before all ages. Therefore he is always called the Son and he is distinguished from God the Father by this relationship of birth or generation, *Filiatio*. The Holy Ghost receives the same Divine nature from the Father (and also from the Son as Catholics believe) but not by generation: otherwise he, too, would be a Son of God. The Divine nature is communicated to him by another relation, to which we know nothing analogous, and for which we therefore have no proper name. For this relation the words *Spiratio* or *Procession* (*Processio*, ἐκπόρευσις) are used; and we say that whereas the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is *born*, the Third Person *proceeds* (*procedit*, ἐκπορεύεται)—at any rate from the Father. God the Son proceeds from the Father too, but for his procession we have and use the special name *generation*.¹ The theological difference then (apart from the other question of tampering with the Creed) is whether the Holy Ghost proceeds

¹ The schoolmen explain this difference by saying that God the Son proceeds from the Father by the *Intellect*, he is the Word (*idea*) of God, and they establish that to proceed in this way, if the Word is a person, exactly satisfies the conditions of birth. A Word that is a person is also necessarily the son of the person who produces it. On the other hand, the Holy Ghost proceeds by the *will* as the act of love. This procession does not establish the relationship of a son, so the Holy Ghost is not the Son of God. As our will does not produce an act of love really distinct from the operation, we have no way of expressing this relation, and so we must fall back on the general words "proceeds" and "procession." Our understanding, on the other hand, does produce an idea or word (*verbum mentale*) that is really distinct from the operation, so that we have a much closer analogy for the generation of God the Son than for the procession of the Holy Ghost. See St. Thomas, *Summa theol.* i. qu. xxvii., art. 2, pp. 3, 4; and Billot: *de Deo uno et trino*, qu. 27, theses 1, 2, 3, pp. 338–368.

from the Father and Son, or from the Father alone. But the issue is not quite so simple as that. Catholics say that he proceeds from both Persons *as from one principle*. The Orthodox in the first place admit that the *temporal* mission of the Holy Ghost (his office as source of grace among men and angels) comes from both Father and Son. On this point our Lord's words are too clear: "The Comforter whom I shall send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father" (John xv. 26).¹ Some of them at any rate are disposed to admit that the Holy Ghost receives the Divine *essence* from (or, as they prefer to say, through) God the Son,² but they all deny that his *Personality* proceeds from or through the Son. And that is the point about which we have argued for a thousand years. Yet the issue is not really so unimportant as might seem. It is involved by two different ways of considering the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. The Latin Church through her schoolmen has evolved a system of metaphysics that is one of the most wonderful examples of subtle consistency ever thought out. As far as it concerns this point it is this: All creatures are made up of two principles called *actus* and *potentia*. The *actus* is the principle of perfection, the *potentia* receives and by receiving limits that perfection. Throughout nature these two principles are seen, always in couples. *Potentia* alone would have no perfection, could not be. *Actus* alone would be unlimited perfection. So all creatures that have a limited nature and limited perfection are made up of double principles. All creatures are *composite*. God alone has no *potentia*, he is pure *actus*, unlimited, infinite perfection. God alone is *simple*. Therefore in God all things are really the same, they are all identified with his one simple, infinite essence. Goodness, might, wisdom, love, all perfections that in us are received into a *potentia* and are really distinct from our essence which limits them, in God are not received into anything; they *are* his essence.

¹ Mogilas: "The Spirit proceeds from the Father alone as from the cause, but he is sent into the world by the Son" (i. qu. 71). Kritopulos, chap. i. (Kimmel, p. 29), &c.

² See, for instance, Palmer's *Visit*, p. 142, &c.

We have love, power, wisdom. God is love, power, wisdom. So we come to the first great axiom about God : In God all things are the same ; an infinite being is necessarily a simple one. *In Deo omnia sunt unum*. That is all philosophy can tell us. Revelation tells us that there are, however, real distinctions in God and three really distinct Persons. The schoolmen now consider the difference between two categories of things—*absolute* things and *relations*. Absolute things are perfections ; they concern the being in whom they are. Goodness makes a being good, and so on. Relations are not perfections ; they concern, not the being in whom they inhere, but something else. Their whole nature is not to add anything in themselves, but only to connote the state of their subject with regard to something else. If I say, for instance : “ This man is white,” I say something about his own quality. If I say : “ This man is equal to that one,” I say nothing positive or absolute about him. I only establish how he stands with regard to the other one. I have stated no entity in him,¹ but only his relation to another. Now in God all *absolute* and *positive* things are identified with the Divine nature. But the opposite extremes of a *relation* cannot metaphysically be identified with each other, or there would be no relation. If, then, there are relations in God, these mutual relations must establish real distinctions. We should never have thought such relations possible, but Revelation has taught us that they exist. There is the relation of Paternity and “ Filiatio,” and the relation of active and passive “ Spiratio.” These relations are also identified with the Divine essence, but they necessarily involve real distinctions between themselves. If there is real Paternity and “ Filiatio,” there must be a really distinct Father and Son. The distinction between God the Father and God the Son is constituted solely and entirely by this relation. In all absolute things they are identified. Their wisdom, power, goodness, are the same thing ; these qualities are simply the one Divine essence.²

¹ At any rate, no positive entity in him. Whether a relation be really distinct from its fundament is another question.

² Essence, nature, and substance in scholastic language mean the same thing.

Therefore the Father would be the same Person as the Son, but for the relation between them. The Persons are constituted by the relations. Were there no relations, God would be one Person ; the three relations constitute three Persons.¹ So we come to the great axiom about the Blessed Trinity : " In God all things are one, except where there intercedes the opposition of a relation "—*Omnia sunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio*.² Now exactly the same principle applies also to the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is God, is identified with every perfection of the simple essence of God. He cannot be distinguished from the other Persons by anything absolute or positive (otherwise he would either have something they have not, or lack something they have, and there would be a limitation in God). He is distinguished from God the Father only by the mutual relation of "Spiratio," or Procession. He proceeds from the Father, and so is distinguished from him. If he did not, he would be the same Person as the Father. *And he proceeds also from the Son*. If he did not, there would be no relation between them, and so, again, he would be identified with God the Son. The only way in which there can be three really distinct Persons in the Blessed Trinity is that there is a real relation between each of them—Paternity between the first and second, Procession between first and third, and Procession also between second and third. So, from the point of view of scholastic theology, the thesis of the Latin schoolmen is unanswerable : " The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son ; indeed, if he did not proceed from the Son, he would not be distinct from him. Wherefore the error of the Greeks in this matter fundamentally overturns the truth of the Trinity." ³ The Orthodox look at the whole

¹ The right way to say this is that the Persons are subsistent relations.

² This was the definition at Florence, *Decretum pro Jacobitis*, Denzinger, p. 598.

³ Bilot, *o.c.* thesis 26. All this reasoning will be found in St. Thomas, *Summa theol.* p. i. qu. iii. art. 7, qu. xxviii.—xxx. xxxvi. He also uses it against the Greeks continually, *cf.* opusc. i. *contra errores Græcorum*, &c. The clearest possible exposition of the whole system is Billot, *de Deo trino*, *passim*, especially the *præviæ disputationes*, de processionibus (pp. 319–338), de relationibus (pp. 371–387), de personis (pp. 422–428).

question from a different side. They have never troubled much about metaphysics; subtle questions concerning simplicity and composition, the absolute and relative, or the principle of distinction in the Blessed Trinity, do not mean very much to them. They begin with the very firm conviction that God the Father, and the Father only, is the source of all things, "from whom all Fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named" (Eph. iii. 15). He is the cause of all things, and they say that he is the *cause* (*airia*) of God the Son and the Holy Ghost¹—an expression that has always sounded wrong to Latin theologians. From this one principle or cause the other Persons of the Trinity derive the Divine nature from all eternity; creatures derive their natures in time, but all from *the one cause only*, from God the Father.² God the Son derives his Divine nature from the Father by generation, God the Holy Ghost derives it from the same Father by his procession, but only from the Father. If we say that he derives it also from the Son, we set up two principles or causes in God, we destroy the faith by which the Father alone is the cause of all things, and we undermine the unity of God by establishing a double source, instead of the one only root and cause and beginning of Divinity, which is the Father. Moreover, we should thus confuse the properties which are special to the three Persons. The incommunicable property of the Father is that he is the *source*; because of this he is distinguished from the others. The property of the Son is to be born, and of the Holy Ghost to proceed. No one of these properties can be shared by another Person without confusing the truth of their distinction. And so the Son cannot share the property of being a source (of the Holy Ghost) with the Father, any more than the Holy Ghost can share the

¹ A number of Greek Fathers say this, *e.gr.* St. John Damascene, *de fide orth.* i. 10, &c.

² The Latin theologians deny this at once. In all relations to creatures God acts by his one simple essence; in this regard the three Persons are not distinguished, but only in their mutual relations. God is the cause of all things, the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not the Father only.

property of being a Son with him.¹ So the Orthodox theologian would set up as a rival thesis to that of the scholastics: "God the Father alone is the source of the Divinity; indeed, if he were not so God would not be one. Wherefore the error of the Latins in this matter fundamentally overturns the truth of the Divine unity."

The question was discussed at the second Council of Lyons in 1274, and at great length at the Council of Florence (1439). The Pope and the Latins began by making a great concession to the Eastern bishops. To say that God the Father is the *cause* of the other Persons, and that they are *caused* (*αἰτιατά*), certainly sounds wrong to us. It seems like calling them creatures; the essential note of the Divine nature, which is the same in the three Persons, would be expressed by us in the statement that it alone is uncaused. However, the Byzantines held strongly to their expression, it had certainly been used by their Catholic Fathers, and it was recognized that after all they only meant what we say when we call God the Father the *principle* (*principium*). So their word was allowed and acknowledged as legitimate in their language. Then the council removed their difficulty about the two "sources" in God by emphasizing strongly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son *as from one source*. This had already been defined at Lyons, and it is necessarily involved in the scholastic interpretation of the mystery. The only difference between the Persons is where a relation intervenes between them. But although there is the relation of generation between the first and second Persons, there is no relation between them *where they regard the third Person*. So in this consideration they become one principle, one source to which the Holy Ghost has the relation of procession. And lastly, since many Easterns objected to saying that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from* the Son, and since their Fathers, notably St. Basil,² had often used

¹ This is the reasoning of Kritopoulos, chap. i.: *The teaching of the Church*. He begins his whole treatise with this chapter, which is all about the procession of the Holy Ghost. The fact is significant. No Catholic would begin a treatise on the faith with a long chapter against the heresy of the Greeks concerning the Filioque.

² De Spir. scto, viii. 21. M.P.G. xxxii. 106.

the form "from the Father through the Son"; this, too, was admitted, and in Greek it was acknowledged to be sufficient to use the preposition *through* (διὰ) instead of *from* (ἐκ). The decree of Florence which for us defines the Catholic faith and which the Easterns then also signed, but afterwards repudiated, is: "The Holy Ghost is eternally from the Father and the Son, and he has his essence and his subsistent being both from the Father and the Son, and he proceeds from both eternally as from one principle and by one spiration. And we declare that what the holy doctors and Fathers say, namely, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son, comes to mean the same thing, that the Son also is the cause, according to the Greeks, or the principle, according to the Latins, of the subsistence of the Holy Ghost."¹

It will be seen how the council, while inevitably maintaining the essential Catholic faith, was scrupulously conciliatory and tolerant towards the Easterns in every point that possibly could be conceded. And this faith of Florence is established, not only by such passages of Scripture as declare that the Holy Ghost is the "Spirit of the Son" (Gal. iv. 6, Rom. viii. 9) just as he is the "Spirit of the Father" (Matt. x. 20), that he "receives from our Lord" (John xvi. 13-15), that he is "sent by Christ" (John xv. 26, xvi. 7), but also by a long chain of Fathers both Latin and Greek. As an example for the Latin Fathers *St. Augustine* may stand: "Why then should we not believe that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from the Son, since he is the Spirit of the Son? If he did not proceed from him, (Christ) after his resurrection would not have breathed on his apostles saying: Receive the Holy Ghost. What then did that breathing mean but that the Holy Ghost proceeds from him too?"² And for the Greeks *St. Athanasius* says: "We are taught by Holy Scripture that he (the Holy Ghost) is the Spiration of the Son of God, and we call the Son of God the source of the Holy Ghost."³ So in this matter, too, the modern Orthodox have forsaken the faith of their fathers.

¹ Denzinger, p. 586.

² Aug. in Ioh. 99, 6 and 7. M.P.L. xxxv. 1888.

³ Athan. de Trin. 19. M.P.G. xxvi. 1212. A long list of Fathers will be found quoted to prove this thesis in any textbook of dogmatic theology. See,

An easier matter to understand is the question of the insertion into the Creed. Its history is this : The second general council (Constantinople I, 381) made very considerable additions to the Nicene Creed.¹ These additions, together with the original form, make up what we call the Nicene Creed, with one exception. The clause about the Holy Ghost was : "And in the Spirit, the Holy One, the Lord, the Lifegiver, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and Son is adored and glorified, who spoke through the prophets." So it has remained unchanged in the East. In the West, in the Latin version, one word has been added that has made all this trouble, and we say : "qui ex Patre *Filioque* procedit," "who proceeds from the Father *and the Son*." The change was not originally made at Rome. It is first seen in Spanish synods of the 5th and 6th centuries.² The *Filioque* was used by these Spanish bishops as a declaration against the Arians, whose heresy lasted longer in Spain than anywhere else.³ The Arians denied that God the Son is equal to the Father in all things. The *Filioque* was meant as an assertion of that equality : "all things that the Father has are mine," said our Lord (John xvi. 15), and the Catholics understand that to include the procession of the Holy Ghost. This declaration in the Creed, then, was a further denial of Arian heresy. The bishops at Toledo who ordered it to be used certainly did not foresee that it would some day give so much annoyance to their distant brethren at Constantinople, nor that it would for ten centuries be the cause of so much

for instance, Hurter, ii. pp. 144-155. Chr. Pesch. ii. pp. 284-294, where also will be found the explanation of the only really difficult passage, in St. John Damascene.

¹ The original Nicene text in Denzinger, p. 17. It ends simply : "and in the Holy Ghost."

² A synod in 447 uses the word ; the third Council of Toledo (589) orders it to be sung aloud in the Creed at Mass.

³ The original West-Gothic kingdom set up by Athaulf (Adolphus) between the Loire and the Garonne in the 5th century was entirely Arian. It spread over Spain, and for a time the Gothic kings violently persecuted Catholics. King Recared (586) became a Catholic through the influence of Leander, Bishop of Seville, whom Gregory the Great made his Legate for all Spain. It was in the reign of Recared and under Leander that the third Council of Toledo was held.

discord. From Spain the Filioque spread into Gaul and Germany. Charles the Great among his many occupations found time to discuss the question, and in 794 he wrote a letter to a certain Elipand defending the addition. He ordered it to be sung in his private chapel at Aachen. The Synod of Aachen in 809 petitioned Pope Leo III (795-816) to introduce it at Rome. The Pope refused. He had no sort of doubt about the doctrine. In the West especially, since St. Augustine had defended it, the procession from both Persons was accepted everywhere, and used as a sort of anti-Arian protest. But the Pope did not see why at that time he should make any change in the Creed. At last, however, Pope Benedict VIII (1012-1024) admitted it at Rome formally. It had already long been used all over the Roman Patriarchate.¹

The Easterns cannot maintain that any addition to any creed is unlawful. Creeds are drawn up by ecclesiastical authority, and the same authority can enlarge them. No creed contains the whole Catholic faith. None, for instance, say anything about the Holy Eucharist, or about any Sacrament except baptism. Moreover, the first Council of Constantinople made enormous additions to the original Nicene Creed.² The Eastern grievance as to the Creed (apart from the question of the doctrine in itself) is first that we made the addition without consulting them. To this a Catholic would answer that the Pope may certainly allow a true doctrine to be expressed in the Creed without asking any one. But even without supposing his Primacy one would point out that the amount of truth expressed by a creed is a disciplinary matter, and that the Roman Patriarch only allowed this addition in his own Patriarchate. They, we may retort, made a long list of additions to the Creed of Nicæa without consulting us—there were no Latin bishops at Constantinople II; but our Patriarch, seeing that these additions are all statements of

¹ For the history of the Filioque see Hergenröther-Kirsch. ii. pp. 142-146.

² It is doubtful whether these additions really were made by the first Council of Constantinople at all. Mgr. Duchesne thinks that they were added later. At any rate our present Creed is always counted as Nicene-Constantinopolitan.

true doctrine,¹ not only made no complaint against them but even adopted them all for his own people. He has never asked them to adopt our one word, but only not to rail at us for using it. But they further urge—and this is the great point—that by adding the Filioque we have incurred the anathema of a general council. The Council of Ephesus declared that: “No one shall say or write, or compose another faith except that one which was defined by the holy Fathers who were gathered together by the Holy Ghost at Nicæa.”² This decree makes no difficulty to us at all. During the Arian troubles every one was continually making creeds, every synod, Catholic or Arian, drew up a form to express its faith. The Council of Ephesus accepts the Creed of Nicæa, with its strongly anti-Arian clauses (“God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God”) as the final pronouncement of the Church on this matter. No one is to draw up a rival creed, no one is to say or write or compose any symbol opposed to or denying that one. It is the common expression of every council: “If any one presumes to contradict this decision, let him be anathema.” It forbids any tampering with what was there defined. It has nothing whatever to do with any further definition on other matters.

But do the Orthodox understand this decree as meaning that no one may add anything to the words of the Creed, even if the addition be quite consistent with what it already defines? Then, indeed, are we all in a bad case, they as much as the Latins, for (and this is the point of the whole question) the Creed that the Council of Ephesus had before it when it made that decree was *not our Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol, but the original Creed of Nicæa*, to which we have both added no less than eleven clauses.³ If, then, its anathema affects the Latins because

¹ Of course the issue is complicated by the fact that they deny that the Filioque is true doctrine. We have already considered that question. Here we are only concerned with the Pope's right to add it (supposing it true) to his Creed.

² Act. vi.

³ Compare the original Nicene Creed in Denzinger, No. 17, with the form we (and they) now use, No. 47. See Duchesne: *Églises séparées*, pp. 77–80, who thinks that the additions to the older form were not even promulgated by the second general council at all, but were added to make a baptismal symbol at Jerusalem between 381 and 451.

of the Filioque, it affects the Easterns too for all their additions. And there is nothing in the mixed symbol that we now all use to make it specially inviolable or to forbid the addition to it of any number of clauses, so long as they are correct and not heretical.¹

4. Transubstantiation.

Some Orthodox theologians now seem to deny that their Church believes Transubstantiation. But there does not appear to be a real difference between us on this point. They certainly all believe in a quite definite, objective Real Presence; they all say that the Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, they understand this quite literally and simply; they adore the Blessed Sacrament and vehemently reject any explanation of a typical or subjective presence, or of a presence of which the mean is faith.² And until lately they both defined Transubstantiation and used the word. The Synod of Jerusalem defines: "the bread and wine at the consecration are changed, transubstantiated, converted and transformed,³ the bread is changed into the very Body of the Lord that was born at Bethlehem from the Ever-Virgin, baptized in the Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, sits at the right hand of God the Father, and will come again in the clouds of heaven, and the wine is converted and transubstantiated⁴ into the very Blood of the Lord that he shed on the cross for the life of the world. And after the consecration we believe that the substance of neither bread nor wine remains, but the very Body

¹ Mgr. Duchesne (pp. 80-81) here notices that the Roman Church did not accept this Creed at all till very late (at the time of Justinian, 527-565). The form that we call the Apostles' Creed is really the old baptismal symbol of the Roman Church. Had she kept to her own traditional form alone Photius would not have discovered his famous grievance, and we should have been spared all this quarrel. But, of course, no one could foresee that, and if there had been no Filioque he would have thought of Azyme bread or bishops' rings, or something.

² Cf. Mogilas's Confession, i. qu. 106, 107. Syn. Jerus. Dositheus: decr. 17, &c.

³ μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιῶσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταρδουθμίζεσθαι.

⁴ μεταποιεῖσθαι καὶ μετουσιῶσθαι.

and Blood of the Lord under the appearance and figure of bread and wine, that is under the accidents of bread . . . so also that the Body and Blood of the Lord are held and divided by our hands and teeth, yet only by accident (*κατὰ συμβεβηκός*, per accidents), that is according to the accidents of bread and wine.”¹ It has been said that the Synod of Jerusalem represents a Romanizing tendency and a very strong reaction against Lukaris’s Protestantism. However, Mogilas says the same thing ; he answers the question : “What is the third Sacrament (*μυστήριον*) ? The Holy Eucharist, or the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread and wine in which really and properly, that is, in actual fact (*κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα*), Jesus Christ is present.”² Indeed, it is impossible to find an Orthodox definition of this Sacrament which does not exactly coincide with the Catholic faith. Nor did they ever attempt to establish a difference on this point. As for the word, they always say *μετουσίωσις*, which is an exact version of Transubstantiation (*μετὰ* = trans ; *οὐσία* = substantia). And in the Russian translation of the Acts of Jerusalem they form a derived word from the Latin Transubstantiatio (*transsubstantziatzija*). Moreover, when Mr. Palmer showed his book with a denial of this faith to the Archpriest Koutnevich, the Archpriest promptly said : “But we believe and teach transubstantiation.”³ Quite lately, however, some of their theologians are disposed to deny it. What they appear to mean is that they are not disposed to commit themselves to all the scholastic theory of substance and accident.⁴ To which we may answer that we also distinguish between the defined dogma and its philosophical explanation, and that the Catholic Church has never officially committed herself to all the theories by which her theologians try to explain her mysteries. Certainly all their definitions abundantly satisfy us, and they could not have any difficulty in accepting the decree of Trent on Transubstantiation.⁵ As for

¹ Dositheus : *decr.* 17.

² *Conf. Orth.* i, qu. 106.

³ *Visit*, p. 145.

⁴ So the note about Philaret of Moscow in Headlam : *The Teaching of the Russian Church*, pp. 8-9.

⁵ Sess. xiii. cap. 4, *Denz.* p. 758.

the word, since they talk Greek and we Latin, they will go on saying *μετουσίωσις* while we say Transubstantiatio.¹

5. The Epiklesis.

A more serious discussion about the Holy Eucharist concerns the moment at which this change takes place. All the Eastern liturgies contain the words of institution, our Lord's own words "This is my Body," and "This is the chalice of my Blood."² But the Orthodox do not believe that these are the words of Consecration; they recite them merely historically, and afterwards they have a solemn invocation of the Holy Ghost, praying him to change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. This invocation is the *Epiklesis* (*Ἐπικλήσις*), and they believe that then, and not till then, are the bread and wine consecrated.³ They also reproach us that we have no Epiklesis in our liturgy, and are disposed to doubt the validity of our Holy Eucharist for this reason. In the first place we have an Epiklesis, although a hardly recognizable one. The prayer *Supplices te rogamus* in our missal is the remnant of the old Latin invocation.⁴ Secondly the Orthodox admit that the words of institution must be said first, and that an Epiklesis alone would not be sufficient. Both sides in this controversy, then, use the two forms, words of institution and Epiklesis; the only question at issue is as to the moment at which Consecration takes place, as to which is, as we should say, the *form* of the Sacrament. The Roman Church has settled the matter for us by commanding the priest to kneel, adore, and then elevate the Blessed Sacrament immediately after the words of institution

¹ The Russians now seem to prefer a really Slav word, *presushchestvlenie*, which they say is an exact rendering of *μετουσίωσις*. They are certainly right in avoiding derived words as far as possible.

² With the doubtful exception of the Nestorian rite; see Brightman: *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 285.

³ The Byzantine Epiklesis is: "We offer to thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, and we pray thee, beg thee, and implore thee to send down thy Holy Spirit on us and on these present gifts, and to make this bread the sacred Body of thy Christ, and to make what is in this chalice the sacred Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit" (Brightman, pp. 386-387).

⁴ See Duchesne: *Origines du culte*, p. 173.

and before the *Supplices te rogamus*.¹ On the other hand, the Orthodox service book adds a note to the words of institution, saying that they are only recited historically, and that therefore it is superfluous and contrary to the right mind of the Eastern Church of Christ to show the bread and wine to the people at this point.² The question of the Epiklesis is a long one. Two remarks about it will be sufficient here. In the first place the Christians of the first centuries certainly did not ask very closely at what exact instant the grace of any Sacrament was given. They obeyed Christ's commands, said the prayers, and did the actions he had appointed, and they believed that God in answer would most certainly do his part. But they did not discuss the exact instant at which all conditions were fulfilled.³ If they had thought about the form of the Holy Eucharist in our terms they would have said that the whole great Eucharistic prayer is the form, from the Preface to the Our Father. Secondly, the fact that all the liturgies have a prayer to the Holy Ghost, asking him to change the bread and wine into the Blessed Sacrament, is no evidence against the change having already been made. The Church always dramatically represents things as happening successively which really must happen at one instant. In our rite of baptism the priest first drives out the devil, then "enlightens, cleanses, and sanctifies" the child by an imposition of hands, drives out the devil again, opens the nostrils and ears, anoints for "life everlasting," baptizes, anoints with chrism, and then gives the white robe and shining light. Presumably the truth of all these symbols is verified at one

¹ The elevation is a late ceremony. It began in France in the 12th century (after Berengar's heresy) and spread throughout the West during the 13th century. Gregory X (1271-1276) ordered it in his *Ceremoniale romanum*.

² *Euchologion* (Venice, 1898), p. 63.

³ Even now such an investigation would only lead to absurd subtleties. At what moment is a child baptized? After the word *Spiritus*, or not till the whole word *Sancti* has been spoken? In the case of Holy Orders the question is still more uncertain. No one can say at what instant the subject becomes a priest. Of course the bishop does everything scrupulously: the subject is certainly not a priest when the service begins, he certainly is one when it ends. And if one must determine the *form* of the Sacrament, one would say that it is the whole prayer from the first laying on of hands to the giving of the instruments.

instant all together. But words take time to say, and these things cannot all be expressed at once, so *dramatically* they are represented as happening successively. In the ordination service the same thing is still more marked; the bishop lays on his hands, then gives the subject "the grace of priesthood," gives him the vestments, blesses again, invokes the Holy Ghost, consecrates with chrism, gives the power of saying Mass, and, at the very end, after the subject has already concelebrated, lays on hands again and gives him the power of forgiving sins. One could argue that a man must at any moment either be a priest or not be one, and that as soon as he is a priest God has given him all these things. In our burial service we pray that God may not hand over the soul of the dead man into the hands of the enemy nor let him bear the pains of hell. That matter was settled irrevocably as soon as he died, probably some days before. These, then, are examples of the way in which the Church, necessarily using our manner of speaking, separates in expression things that before God must happen at once. And so in the Mass, just as we speak of "this spotless offering" some time before the Consecration,¹ we might invoke the Holy Ghost to work the great change afterwards (as all the Eastern Uniates do), without doubting that really the spotless offering is made and the Holy Ghost changes and consecrates when we say the words of institution. But since we now do ask at what exact moment the bread and wine are consecrated, Catholics are most certainly right in fixing it at the time we say our Lord's own words. We know that he said those words, and that he told us to do as he had done. There is no evidence for any sort of Epiklesis at the Last Supper.²

6. Purgatory.

The Orthodox appear to differ from us as to what happens after death. They pray for the dead as much as we do, but they

¹ At the offertory: "Receive, holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless offering. . . ."

² For the whole question of the Epiklesis see Lingens: *Die eucharistische Consecrationsform* in the *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie* (Innsbruck), 1897, pp. 51-106.

conceive their state in another way. Their opinion seems to be that all the dead sleep and wait passively in a middle state till the day of judgement. Then the good will go to heaven and the wicked to hell. This applies to the Saints too. And they deny our doctrine of Purgatory, and are indignant at our indulgences as well as at our belief that Saints enjoy a complete reward before the last day.¹ In this case, too, there is practically no difference between the official teaching of the two Churches. The Orthodox believe that "by no means all who die in sin are cast into hell" and that "we must offer prayers and the holy Sacrifice and generous alms for the dead."² The sleep in which the dead wait until the last day is already a foretaste of their future fate. If they do not admit a special place, Purgatory, they speak of a part of hell in which sinners who will be saved eventually wait, or of a prison, and they distinguish between those who die in grave sins and who are lost for ever and those who die in sin and yet will be saved after being cleansed.³ The point to which they most strongly object is the *fire* of Purgatory. At the Council of Florence, Bessarion argued against fire, and the Greeks were then assured that the Roman Church has never committed herself to belief in this fire. That is still true. All a Catholic is bound to believe about Purgatory is contained in the definition of Trent: "There is a Purgatory and souls there detained are helped by the prayers of the faithful and especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar."⁴ It is difficult to see how the Orthodox could deny this. As for the sleep of the just until the last day, such a belief seems inconsistent with the prayers to the Saints which form as large a part of their devotion as of ours and with the stories of miraculous apparitions of our Lady and the Saints, of which they have at least as many as we have. They are wrong in saying that we believe the Saints enjoy perfect happiness before the last day. Our theologians teach that the resurrection of the body will add

¹ This is how Anthimos VII expressed his grievance against the Papic Church in his answer to Leo XIII.

² Mogilas : *Conf. Orth.* i. qu. 45.

³ See the theologians quoted by Hergenröther, *Photius*, iii. p. 650. We have already seen what the great Greek Fathers say on this question (p. 105 *seq.*).

⁴ Sess. xxv. Denz. p. 859.

yet another element to the joy of the just.¹ As for *indulgences*, here, too, they should distinguish between the teaching of the Roman Church and the pious imaginations and practices of some of her children. The Church says only that : " Since the power of giving indulgences has been granted by Christ to his Church, and since she has used this divinely-given power from most ancient times, the holy Synod (of Trent) teaches and commands that the use of indulgences, which are exceedingly good for Christian people and are approved by the authority of general councils, shall be kept in the Church." ² In this matter the "Church of the Seven Councils, one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic," which Anthimos VII so vehemently professed to follow, agrees with the Council of Trent. During the centuries of persecution the *libellus*, by which part of canonical penances were remitted because of a martyr's intercession, and the *libellaticus* who had procured himself such a remission were as well known as indulgences and the pious persons who use them are to us now. As for possible excesses of zeal and imaginations beyond what the Church teaches in such matters as these, the same Council of Trent orders that : " More difficult and subtle questions, which do not make for edification and from which as a rule no one receives an increase of piety, shall be forbidden in sermons to the people. And bishops shall not allow uncertain things or such as bear the mark of falsehood to be propagated or discussed. And they shall forbid as scandalous and as an offence to the faithful whatever serves only for curiosity or superstition or whatever savours of filthy lucre." ³ That popular abuses exist is always inevitable ; nor would it be just to make the Orthodox Church responsible for everything that is contained in little Greek manuals of piety. " Where," says Mgr. Duchesne, " are there not abuses ? Instead of being scandalized at them, it would be better to come and help us repress them. When the union is restored it will not only be good for the Greeks ; Latins, too, will profit by it." ⁴

¹ Cf. e.g. Chr. Pesch. : *Præl. dogm.*, ix. (Freiburg, 1902), p. 337. Pope John XXII went further still and put a Dominican in gaol for contradicting him.

² Sess. xxv. Denz. p. 862.

³ Ibid. p. 859.

⁴ *Églises sép.* p. 108.

7. The Immaculate Conception.

This dogma, too, they now deny. Lord Anthimos declared that the "Church of the Seven Councils" had defined that there is only one immaculate conception, that of Christ, and that the "Papic Church" defines in opposition the immaculate conception of his blessed Mother as well.¹ This is absolutely false. The Church of the Seven Councils, that is, the Catholic Church down to the year 787, defined nothing on this subject at all. We have seen that the feast of our Lady's conception came to us from the East, and we have seen, too, how some of the Greek Fathers already imply that her conception was holy and free from original sin (p. 107). After the schism some of their theologians taught this doctrine plainly. Isidore Glabas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica († c. 1393), writes: "The all-pure Virgin, as is right, alone can refuse to apply to herself the words of the royal prophet, she alone can say: I was not conceived in iniquity, and again: My mother did not conceive me in sin; this privilege is contained in the great things done to me by him who is mighty."² Metrophanes Kritopulos was the first person in the East who formally denied the immaculate conception,³ but others still defended it until the definition of 1854 seemed a sufficient reason to these people, who generally are so jealous of the privileges and honour of the all-holy Mother of God, for entirely rejecting what a Roman Pope had declared.

8. Modern Orthodox Theology.

There are other points in which the Orthodox differ from us in questions of rite which involve dogma, such as the administration of baptism and extreme unction, and which may, therefore, be discussed in the next chapter (pp. 420-425). They have had heated theological discussions, such as the question of frequent communion at Mount Athos in the 18th century, the

¹ *Églises sép.* p. 110.

² M.P.G. cxxxix. 52. See a number of quotations in the *Echos d'Orient*, vii. pp. 257-270: *L'immaculée conception et les Grecs modernes*. Bessarione, ix., x., xi.: *L'immacolata concezione . . . e la chiesa ortodossa* (by Mgr. Marini).

³ *Ibid.* p. 260.

question as to where the portion for the Mother of God should be placed on the paten, whether Requiem services may be held on Sunday as well as Saturday¹ which, as Diomedes Kyriakos says, "show the simplicity of the monks." And there has been a great discussion about the portions of the holy bread which they put aside for our Lady and the Saints before consecration (p. 417, n. 1). Not only are they uncertain whether these portions are consecrated or not, but some of them have proposed the horrible theory that they are changed into the body of these Saints.² But these are less important matters; the heat of controversy they evoked is over now, and it would be ungenerous to insist on them. They have also silently given up many of the old accusations against us. One hears little now of the wickedness of unleavened bread that once so horrified them.³ Nor are they any longer distressed that our bishops shave and wear rings. On the other hand, Latin bishops have put an end to another reproach in that they no longer go a-fighting. As for our celibacy, that, too, they have learnt to let alone.

The great weakness of Orthodox theology as a whole is that it falls between two ideals. They insist very much on the antiquity of their belief and rites. They indignantly deny that their Church has ever developed, and they are never tired of protesting against Latin "novelties." Antiquity pure and unchanged, and no modification for modern times, is their great cry. And yet their antiquity has already reached an advanced stage of development. It is certainly not that of the time of the Apostles. They accept the very definite decrees of seven councils, they print in their books the accurate analysis of the Athanasian Creed. Their hierarchy with Constantinople as the chief throne is quite a late development. Their sumptuous ritual, gorgeous vestments, and exact rubrics all represent,

¹ Kyriakos, iii. pp. 74, *seq.*; *E. d'Or.* ii. pp. 321-331, *La grande controverse des Colybes*. Strange that the question of frequent communion agitated the Orthodox Church at the same time that the Jansenists were arguing against it in France.

² *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 65-78, *La préparation des Oblats dans le rite grec*.

³ But Anthimos VII remembered this too, in his answer to Leo XIII (see p. 435).

not the first age, but the palmy days of the Byzantine Roman Empire. And that is their weakness. One can understand the Catholic ideal of a living Church, developing always under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, defining more closely each element of the old faith as the presence of some new heresy makes her more conscious of what she has hitherto held implicitly. One can understand the ideal of a man who will hear nothing of any development at all, who will allow no change, and who wishes to go back exactly to something that he believes to have been the state of the Apostolic Church. But why develop down to the year 787, and then rigidly refuse to move any further? What is the especial sanctity of the Byzantine world? Why accept and defend such innovations as the place of New Rome in the hierarchy and the independence of Cyprus, and then boast of one's unchanged antiquity? Why accept decrees of councils which define what was not defined before, and yet rail against any later definition as a Papal novelty?¹ They make so much of their ancient customs and venerable traditions: they think it so horrible a sacrilege even to discuss them. And yet they are not the customs of the age of Christ or the Apostles, they are only strangely fossilized remnants of the dead Empire. And so they satisfy no one. The Protestant thinks them as corrupt with their images, relics, vestments, and incense as any Papist; the Catholic thinks their Church dead and petrified. The radical affliction from which the Orthodox Church suffers is *arrested development*.

Summary.

The present faith of the Orthodox Church agrees in the very great majority of cases with ours. It is without comparison the Communion that stands nearest to the Catholic Church.

¹ It is no answer to say that it is only because the first seven councils really were œcumenical. There have always been heretics absent from councils. Has the true Orthodox Church lost the power of summoning a general council, or why has she let that power get atrophied for eleven centuries? And they are angry with many of our "novelties" in Canon Law as well as in faith, in spite of the enormous changes made by the founding of national Churches among them during the 19th century.

The Orthodox express their faith by the Creeds, the decisions of the first seven general councils, and also by certain Confessions drawn up by Gennadios II of Constantinople, Peter Mogilas of Kiev, Dositheos of Jerusalem (the Synod of Jerusalem), and Metrophanes Kritopulos of Alexandria ; though this last one has less authority. They believe their Communion to be the only true Church of Christ, and entirely reject the Pope's universal supremacy. They say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father alone, and are indignant that we add the word *Filioque* to the Creed. About Transubstantiation there is no real difference, but they believe that that change takes place, not when the words of institution are said, but at the Invocation of the Holy Ghost (*Epiklesis*) which follows them in their liturgy. They deny Purgatory, but believe in what comes to the same thing, though they specially reject the idea of a cleansing fire ; and since the Pope has defined our Lady's Immaculate Conception they deny this too. In spite of their boast of unchanging antiquity, their theology, rites, and Canon Law represent, not the first ages but a comparatively advanced development, that of the Byzantine Period. And they stay there, satisfying neither the need of continuous development that is the mark of a living Church, nor the rival ideal of unchanged primitive observance.

CHAPTER XIII

ORTHODOX RITES

ALL the Orthodox Churches use the Byzantine rite in various languages. The Church of Constantinople has even foisted her use on those of Alexandria and Antioch ; and they have forsaken their much older and more venerable liturgies, and have adopted that of the comparatively new see which deposed them from their original places in the hierarchy. It is only among the Copts and Jacobites, whether Uniate or schismatic, that the ancient rites of St. Mark and St. James are celebrated. The Orthodox all follow Byzantium.¹ It is impossible to say exactly when the older uses disappeared. In the 12th century Theodore Balsamon says that the Church of Jerusalem had already adopted the Byzantine rite. It is hardly necessary to point out how different this intolerance of Constantinople is from the attitude of Old Rome. True, the Roman use is enormously the most wide-spread in the Catholic Church, so much so that many people apparently think that it is the only one. But that is part of the general confusion of the Roman Patriarchate with the Catholic Church. The Roman Liturgy

¹ There are two exceptions to this. At Zakynthos the Greek liturgy of St. James is celebrated once a year on October 23rd (St. James's feast) ; Dionysius Latas, Archbishop of Zakynthos, published the text of this liturgy in 1886. And now the Patriarch of Jerusalem has also restored it for one day in the year (December 31st). It was first used in 1900 ; Lord Epiphanius, of the river Jordan, celebrated with many priests, and the students of the college of the Holy Cross sang. The edition of Latas was exactly followed, and the service lasted three hours. See *E. d'Or.* iv. p. 247.

is used practically throughout the Roman Patriarchate,¹ as is natural ; each Patriarchate has its uniform rite. But the Popes have never tried to force their liturgy on Catholics of the other Patriarchates. Still, as always, the Catholics of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and the Melkites who represent Constantinople use their own venerable rites, as do the Catholic Armenians and Chaldees. And that in the Catholic Church the Latin Patriarchate is now so enormously greater than all the others put together is due simply to accident. On the one hand the Western lands have grown and flourished, and have been enlarged by two new continents—America and Australia—while the East remained stagnant and was overrun by Islam. No one could foresee this when Rome took for her Patriarchate Italy, Illyricum, and then the wild and desolate lands of North-Western Europe, full of savages that she was to convert, whereas Alexandria had the fat land of Egypt, Antioch had flourishing Syria, and at Constantinople was the splendour of Cæsar's new home. On the other hand, most of the Eastern Christians have fallen into schism ; and so, of course, there are only a few (about five millions) to represent their rites inside the Catholic Church, as against the 225 million Latins. But if ever that schism be healed, then a more equal proportion would be established between our different liturgies, and with a Catholic Russia that would, of course, go on using her own Byzantine rite in Old Slavonic, no one could any longer so completely forget the Eastern Catholics as to say that all our priests say the same Mass, or that Latin is the language of the whole Catholic Church. Meanwhile, whereas the preponderance of the Latin rite with us is due to quite natural and unforeseen causes, the exclusive use of the Byzantine rite among the Orthodox is due to the systematic jealousy and ambition of the Patriarchs of Constantinople. They, not Rome, are the centralizers who ignore history for the sake of uniformity, and when people accuse the Pope of having crushed national Churches they mistake the culprit, they mean the Patriarch of New Rome, not the Pope of Old Rome.

In one point, however, there is no attempt at uniformity among the Orthodox—in language. Whereas they must all

¹ Except, of course, for the Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites.

use the same rites, they may celebrate them in almost any language they please. Oddly enough the result of this is not that they generally use a language understood of the people. In most cases the liturgical language is an older form of the vulgar tongue, hardly more intelligible to the faithful than the original Greek. The Byzantine rite, after the Roman use, by far the most widely spread of any, is celebrated in these languages : *Greek* throughout the Great Church, except where Servian and Roumanian priests insist on using their own languages to the great annoyance of the Patriarch (pp. 326, 332), throughout part of Jerusalem, most of the Antiochene and nearly all the Alexandrine Patriarchate, and in the Greek Church ; *Arabic* in parts of Antioch (it has spread very much since Meletios, p. 287) and Jerusalem, and in a few Churches in Egypt ; *Old Slavonic* or Church Slavonic in Russia, Bulgaria (and by all the Exarchists), Czernagora, Servia, and by the Orthodox in Austria and Hungary ; *Roumanian* by the national Church of that country. These four languages are the chief ones. Later Russian missions have caused the following to be used too : *Esthonian*, *Lettish*, and *German* in the Baltic provinces ; *Finnish* and *Tartar* among the converts in Finland and Siberia ; *Eskimo* and *North American Indian* in Alaska and thereabouts ; *Chinese* and *Japanese* by the missionaries in those countries ; and, lastly, *English* by a body of Austrians in the United States who were originally Uniates, but who have now placed themselves under the Orthodox bishop of Alaska at San Francisco.¹ Extinct languages, in which this rite is no longer celebrated, are *Syriac*, once used by the Orthodox under Antioch, and *Georgian*, the language of the now destroyed Georgian Church.

The chief points in connection with the Byzantine rite are the Calendar and feasts, the service books, churches and vestments, Church music, the Holy Liturgy, and lastly, the principal other services, the Divine Office, administration of Sacraments, and various blessings and sacramentals.

¹ This list from Brightman : *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. lxxxi.-lxxxii. I have left out the Uniates, who use the same liturgy. The four languages first named are the more important ones (Greek, Old Slavonic, Arabic, Roumanian) ; the others are used only by small communities.

1. The Calendar.

All the Orthodox still use the Julian Calendar (Old Style). By this time (1907) they are thirteen days behind us; they were keeping the feast of the Circumcision (January 1st) on our January 14th. They calculate Easter, of course, just as we do (the first Sunday after the fourteenth day after the first new moon after March 6th), and, as they see the moon just as we do, this leads to further complications—they count from their March 6th (our March 19th), and the new moon after that is not always the same as ours, so the whole process becomes doubly wrong. This year, for instance, our Easter Day falls on March 31st, theirs falls on their April 22nd, our May 5th. Sometimes, however, these two wrongs make a right, and the Easters coincide; if the new moon, for instance, were on March 23rd (their March 10th), we should both count together and keep the feast on the same day, although we should call the date differently. All the Orthodox know quite well that they are wrong in their Calendar, and that we are as right as any one can be. But it is a point of honour with them (as it was in England till 1740) not to accept the correction of a Roman Pope. They feel the inconvenience of disagreeing with the whole civilized world in this matter very strongly (dating a cheque in Greece is a portentous matter), and they are everlastingly discussing whether they cannot put things right. All laymen and all the Governments want to adopt the Gregorian Calendar; but hitherto the Orthodox Church has resolutely set her face against any change. The Church of the Seven Councils cannot degrade herself by accepting a Papic innovation.¹

The liturgical year, followed by all this Communion, begins on September 1st, the feast of St. Simon Stylites, which they mark

¹ For their endless discussions on this subject see *e.gr.* *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 374-377; iv. pp. 306-307; v. p. 244; vii. pp. 91-99, &c. The latest news is that the Russian Government is considering the question, and proposes to introduce an entirely new Calendar, neither Julian nor Gregorian. Of course, it will be simply the Gregorian Calendar (nothing else is possible) with some little peddling change about leap-year, so that they can pretend they have not taken ours and can call it something else—the Nicholas II Calendar or something.

as "The beginning of the Indict, that is of the new year," and they say in their Menologion (p. 402) that on this day our Lord began his public life by preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth, when he took the scroll and read Isaias' prophecy: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me," &c. (St. Luke iv. 16-30). The civil Indiction of the Eastern Empire began on this day.¹ The first great fasting-time, which corresponds to our Advent, begins on November 15th, "the fast of Christ's birth," and lasts till Christmas Eve—forty days. Then comes Christmas (December 25th) with its cycle of feasts. The Easter fast (Lent) begins on the Monday after the sixth Sunday before Easter (our Quinquagesima); they do not fast on Saturdays nor Sundays during this time.² They prepare for Lent by abstaining from flesh meat after the seventh Sunday before Easter (Sexagesima), which they call "Sunday of Meatlessness" (τῆς ἀποκρέω), but they still eat butter and cheese during the week, and they call it "cheese-week" (τῆς τυρινῆς). The really severe fast, including abstinence from meat, cheese, butter, eggs, &c., begins after the sixth Sunday before Easter. For the tenth week before Easter (the week before our Septuagesima) they have an attractive rubric: "It should be known that the horrid Armenians keep their abominable fast, which they call Artziburion, three or four times during this week; but we eat cheese and eggs every day, thereby refuting their dogma and heresy."³ The cycle of Holy Week and Easter then comes, as with us; and Ascension Day and Whit Sunday follow, of course, on the fortieth and fiftieth days after Easter. The fast

¹ An Indiction in Old Rome was a space of fifteen years arranged for tax-gathering—*indicere tributum*. See Nilles: *Kalendarium*, i. pp. 264, *seq.*

² The Church of Milan follows exactly the same order as the Byzantines, beginning Lent on the same day and not fasting on Saturday and Sunday (Nilles, ii. pp. 76-77, notes 5 and 6). It will be remembered how distressed their fathers were that ours fasted on Saturdays, and that we eat cheese on Monday and Tuesday before Ash Wednesday (pp. 153, 178).

³ Nilles, ii. p. 8. They have a foolish and offensive story about a diabolical dog called Atzebur (*ibid.*). They use violent language against the Armenians for beginning Lent before them, and they are (or were) equally angry with us for beginning it two days later. These absurd people really conceive as the ideal for the whole Catholic world an exact following of all the local customs of their own patriarchate.

of the Apostles begins on the day after the first Sunday after Pentecost (which is their All Saints' Day) and lasts till June 28th, and the fast of the Mother of God lasts from August 1st to August 14th. They have, then, four great fasts in the year, all of which they call "forty days" (τεσσαρακοσταί), although they do not all really last so long. Nor are they kept so severely. The Easter fast (Lent) is the only one during which they fast every day (except Saturday and Sunday).¹

Throughout this year, then, fall a great number of feasts. They distinguish them into three classes—feasts of our Lord (ἐορταὶ δεσποτικαί), of the Mother of God (θεομητρικαί), and of the Saints (τῶν ἁγίων). The feasts of our Lord are Christmas, the Circumcision, Epiphany (on which they chiefly remember his baptism),² the Holy Meeting—ὑπαπάντη (of our Lord and St. Simeon, the Presentation, February 2nd), the Annunciation, the awakening of Lazarus (Saturday before Palm Sunday), Palm Sunday, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, Whit Sunday, the Transfiguration (August 6th), and Holy Rood (September 14th). The feasts of our Lady³ are the same as our older ones, except that they count Candlemas and Lady Day as feasts of Christ. The chief ones are her birthday (September 8th), Presentation (November 21st), Conception (the child-bearing of the mother of the Mother of God, Anne, December 9th) and her falling asleep (κοίμησις, August 15th). On July 2nd they keep, not the Visitation, but the Preservation of the robe of the Mother of God at the Blachernæ (the old Imperial Palace at Constantinople),⁴ and December 26th is the Memory of the Mother of God. They have, then, one and often several Saints for every day in the year.⁵ They divide feasts according to their solemnity into three classes—great, middle, and lesser days.

¹ See Kattenbusch : *Conjessionskunde*, i. pp. 475-478, *die Fasten*.

² They call the Epiphany the feast of the Holy Lights (τὰ ἅγια φῶτα).

³ Ἡ παναγία Θεοτόκος is what they regularly call our Lady—the all-holy Mother of God. In ordinary conversation one generally says ἡ παναγία (the all-holy Lady) only.

⁴ A relic brought to the Church of the Blachernæ in the 5th century (Nilles, i. pp. 200-202).

⁵ Many of these are Saints whom we should certainly not consider to be so (p. 103, *seq.*). St. Photius's feast is on February 6th (p. 165).

Easter naturally stands alone and above all ; it is "the feast" (ἡ ἑορτή), then follow sixteen other great feasts, twelve very special ones—Christmas, Epiphany, Candlemas, Lady Day, Palm Sunday, the Ascension, Whit Sunday, the Transfiguration, Falling Asleep of our Lady, her Birthday, Holy Rood (September 14th), and the Presentation ; and four less special but still great days—the Circumcision, St. John the Baptist's birthday (the birth of the Forerunner, June 24th), and beheading (August 29th), and SS. Peter and Paul (June 29th). The middle feasts are those of certain chief Saints, the Apostles, the three holy Hierarchs (SS. Basil, Gregory Naz., and John Chrys., January 30th), SS. George (April 23rd), Constantine and Helen (May 21st), Elias the Prophet (July 20th), Cosmas and Damian (November 1st), Nicholas (December 6th), &c. All the other days are lesser feasts. They keep a number of our Saints—SS. Anastasius, holy martyr of Rome, Clement of Rome, Boniface, Leo Pope of Rome (Leo I), Benedict, Martin the Confessor Pope of Rome, Laurence, &c., as well as a great many Old Testament Saints—Moses, David, Job, and all the Prophets.¹ They name the Sundays after the subject of the Gospel read ; thus our Septuagesima is the Sunday of the Prodigal Son, Sexagesima, Sunday of the Second Coming of Christ, &c.² The first Sunday of Lent is the feast of Orthodoxy, the memory of the restoration of the holy pictures after the second Council of Nicæa (787).³ The Saturdays before Meatless Sunday (Sexagesima) and Whit Sunday are both All Souls' Days, and the Sunday after Whit Sunday (our Trinity) is All Saints.⁴

2. The Orthodox Service Books.

The books that contain the prayers and rubrics for their

¹ For the whole Calendar see Nilles, i. pp. 2-25, and the Dissertation pp. 32-34.

² They name the weeks from the *following* Sunday.

³ Nilles, ii. pp. 101-121.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 20-21, 424-430. November 1st is SS. Cosmas and Damian, the "holy moneyless (ἀνάργυροι) physicians," because they cured people and would take no fees. For the Orthodox Calendar see also Kattenbusch *Confessionskunde*, i. pp. 447, 456, *das Kirchenjahr*.

various services are much more complicated than ours. They have no such compendium as the Roman breviary. There are eleven chief books: The *Typikon* (τυπικόν) is a perpetual Calendar containing the list of the feasts and arrangements for every possible coincidence; each special office is noted, and the first words of the lessons, hymns, &c., are given;¹ the *Euchologion* (εὐχολόγιον) corresponds more or less to our missal. It contains the complete text of the three liturgies that they use, but also the administration of the other Sacraments and various sacramentals (blessings and so on); the *Triodion* (τριώδιον) contains the Divine Office for the movable days from the tenth Sunday before Easter (our Sunday before Septuagesima) till Holy Saturday; the *Pentekostarion* (πεντηκοστήριον) continues the Triodion from Easter Day till All Saints' Sunday (first after Pentecost); the *Oktoechos* (ὀκτώηχος) has the offices for the Sundays during the rest of the year with their various kinds of hymns, &c., arranged according to the eight modes (ὀκτῶ ἤχοι); the *Parakletike* (παρακλητική) has the week-day offices. These books, then, make up the movable days and correspond more or less to our *Proprium temporis*. The *Proprium sanctorum* is contained in the twelve *Menaïas* (μηναῖα), one for each month, which gives the life of the Saint of the day to be read (our lessons in the second nocturn) and their special hymns and prayers. The *Menologion* (μηνολόγιον) is an abbreviated menaia. The *Horologion* (ὠρολόγιον) contains the day-hours and the chief feasts from the Menologion. The *Psalter* (ψαλτήριον), *Gospel* (εὐαγγέλιον), and *Apostle* (ἀπόστολος = Epistles and Acts) contain the parts of the Bible read liturgically.²

¹ Nilles, i. lxx-lxix, gives a specimen (the Transfiguration, August 6th) from the *Typikon* published at Constantinople in 1874.

² The Greek texts of these books are published by the Phoenix Press at Venice, and (for the Uniates) by Propaganda at Rome. Then there are translations into the other liturgical languages. Provost Maltzew has translated the Russian ones into German, and Goar edited the Euchologion with copious notes (see list of books, p. xxvi., seq.). Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i., is adapted from the Menaia, and ii. from the Triodos, Pentekostarion, Oktoechos, and Parakletike. See also Kattenbusch: *Confessionskunde*, i. pp. 478-486, *die hlgen Bücher*.


3. The Churches, Vestments, and Sacred Vessels.

The commonest form of Orthodox *church* is a long building with transepts and with three apses at the east end, of which the central one is very much the largest. There are generally several cupolas, often of a bulbous shape, in Russia, covered with bright-coloured tiles—green, with a yellow design or gold and blue—bearing gilt crosses. Sometimes there is a belfry standing separate by the church. All the larger churches have a narthex across the west end ; it is used for various services and for a great part of the funeral rites. From the narthex one or three doors lead into the nave of the church. This is the place of the laity. The men are separated from the women ; either they go to different sides or the women have a gallery. Beyond the nave, usually raised by a few steps, is the choir, where the singers have their places right and left, as with us. In the middle of the choir stands the deacon's ambon (ἄμβων), which is not a sort of pulpit like the old Latin ones, but a raised platform on which a small reading-desk is placed when it is wanted. The first thing a stranger notices in any church of the Byzantine rite is the great *Ikonostasis* (εἰκονόστασις, picture-screen) that stretches across the church behind the choir, reaches high up towards the roof, and hides the sanctuary and altar. It has three doors—the royal door in the middle, deacon's door on the south (to the right as one looks towards the altar), and the door for other servers on the north side. These doors have curtains behind them. The whole of the screen is covered with holy pictures. On the royal door itself is always an Annunciation, and there are generally the four Evangelists too. The other pictures are usually arranged in this order : Our Lord on the right of the royal door, and the Blessed Virgin on the left ; these fill up the spaces to the other doors. On the other side of the deacon's door St. John the Baptist (the Orthodox do not forget that he is the greatest of all Saints) and on the other side of the servers' door the patron of the church. Above the doors comes a row of pictures of the events of the chief feasts, above that are the twelve Apostles, higher still the prophets, and above all a great cross (not a


crucifix) reaching up into the roof. Before all these pictures one sees a great number of lamps hanging.¹ If one goes through the Ikonostasis one comes to the sanctuary (*ιερατεῖον*); the laity are not allowed here. In the middle stands the altar, a solid square of stone, covered with a linen cloth down to the ground all round. Over the linen cloth is laid a handsomely embroidered silk or velvet covering. Some of the things used in the Holy Liturgy are placed on it, otherwise it stands bare and empty. There is never any sort of retable or reredos; the altar is never pushed up against a wall; there are no crowded candlesticks nor pots of flowers. Certainly the great bare altar, which so obviously has no other purpose than to be used for the holy Sacrifice, looks very dignified and stately. The rule is to have only one altar in each church; although some very large cathedrals have, as a matter of fact, side chapels with altars. The Orthodox also have a curious principle that the altar as well as the priest must be fasting from midnight, that is that no previous liturgy must have been celebrated on it that day. So there is practically never more than one Holy Liturgy each day in their churches. On the north side of the altar is a large credence table called the *prothesis* (*πρόθεσις*); on the south side is the Diakonikon, which corresponds to our sacristy, where the vestments and vessels are kept. But it is in no way separated off from the sanctuary. Around the central apse behind the altar are seats for the priests, with the bishop's throne (in every church) in the middle. When the bishop is not present the throne remains, of course, empty.²

¹ The appearance of a Greek or a Russian ikon is well known. To protect it it is covered with a shield of metal (silver or gilt) on which the outlines of the picture are stamped, but which is pierced to show the face and hands. So one sees what looks like a metal bas-relief with painted (usually almost black) face and hands. But the whole oil-painting (on wood, as a rule) is underneath, and it is possible to persuade the sacristan or priest to take off the shield and to show one the whole picture. Our Lady of Perpetual Succour is a well-known example of a purely Byzantine ikon among us. Unfortunately they are now beginning to paint imitations of Düsseldorf pictures.


² The principle of having the bishop's throne in every church of his diocese, which waits till he comes to fill it, is again one of the very beautiful and right practices which the comparative conservatism of the Orthodox



BISHOP



PRIEST



DEACON



The Orthodox *vestments* (they are used by the Uniates as well, of course) correspond more or less to ours. It is a very curious case of a parallel evolution. They too, like ours, have developed out of the ordinary Roman dress of the first three centuries; only difference of rite and taste make them now look quite different. In the first place they have nothing like our sequence of liturgical colours¹ and no idea of definite liturgical colour at all. Their vestments are generally white or red and are now always stiff with heavy gold embroidery. They naturally take the handsomest set (of whatever colour) for the greatest feasts. They do, however, as a rule, use black for funerals.² When a *Bishop* is about to celebrate the Holy Liturgy, he first puts on over his cassock the *Sticharion* (στικχάριον).³ This is the old tunica talaris, our alb, but it may be of any colour and is generally made of silk or even velvet. It is a long shirt with sleeves, reaching to the feet and wrists, and it is embroidered at the bottom. The bishop's sticharion has red and white bands running from the shoulders to the feet (ποταμοί, the Roman clavus, which we have on our dalmatics). Then he puts on the *Epitrachelion* (ἐπιτραχήλιον, stole). It is worn round the neck and hangs down in front nearly to the feet. The two bands are generally hooked together or even

Church has kept. It is true that the way in which she clings to one stage of development is altogether unjustifiable theologically, but it results in a number of very curious and picturesque remnants of a past age, which exist only in her services. Nothing in the world is more dead than the Empire that fell with Constantine XII, and yet its ghost still lingers around the Byzantine altars. For the Church and its furniture see Kattenbusch: *Confessionskunde*, i. pp. 487-488, *Kirchenraum*.

¹ Our regular sequences of colour do not appear to have begun before the 12th century. Even then there was for a long time an enormous variety of uses. Our five Roman colours were not introduced everywhere till after the Renaissance.

² They also very commonly use red for times of fasting or penance, because it is a darker colour than white. Their rule of colours is sometimes expressed in this way: white for all feasts, red for fasts and black for funerals. It must then be added that any colour or combination of colours may stand for white.

³ An amice is often used, but it is not a liturgical vestment. Its object is only to keep the vestments clean in hot weather, like the strips of linen that are sometimes tacked to our stoles.

permanently sewn up, leaving a loop through which he puts his head. It is ornamented with crosses or figures of Saints and ends in fringes.¹ The *Zone* (ζώνη, girdle) comes next, not a cord, but a narrow belt of stuff joined behind by a clasp. It is ornamented with crosses and holds together the epitrachelion and sticharion. Over the wrists the bishop then puts the *Epimanikia* (ἐπιμανίκια), which correspond to our bishops' gloves. They are bands like cuffs, or like long gloves with the part for the hand cut off, and they too are embroidered with crosses or holy images. Their origin seems to have been, not a handkerchief, but rather the old idea of covering the hands before touching sacred things. They do not, then, answer to our handkerchief-maniple. Gradually the inconvenience and clumsiness of gloves caused all of them to be cut away except the covering of the wrist. They now just cover the ends of the sleeves of the sticharion, and are worn on both arms. The *Epigonation* (ἐπιγονάριον) is a lozenge of stiff stuff (often lined with cardboard), about a foot in length, with a cross or image embroidered on it. It hangs at the right side from the girdle by a riband, and reaches to the knee. It appears that this was originally a handkerchief, and that it therefore corresponds to our maniple. Now its symbolical meaning is a sword of justice.² Every bishop now wears the *Sakkos* (σάκκος). This is a vestment exactly like our dalmatic, a tunic reaching to below the knees, with short sleeves and divided up the sides. It is very richly embroidered all over, and the sides are joined again by bows of riband or clasps. Originally only the Patriarchs wore the sakkos, and other bishops had the same phainolion (chasuble) as priests. The use of the sakkos among all bishops appears to date from about the time of the fall of Constantinople. Over the sakkos comes the *Omophorion* (ὠμοφόριον, our pallium). The great omophorion, worn at the beginning of the liturgy, is a wide band of silk or velvet embroidered with crosses and a lamb. The bishop passes it loosely round his neck, and one

¹ It is considerably wider than our stole, each half being about four inches across and the two sewn together covering eight inches at least down the front of the sticharion.

² The Pope alone among Western bishops wears the epigonation.

end hangs down in front (from the left side), the other behind. It is then kept in its places with ornamented pins. The small omophorion is simply a curtailed form of the great one. It is worn from after the Gospel to the end of the liturgy, and for ordinations and other functions.¹ A bishop also wears a pectoral cross and a little medal containing a relic (ἐγκόλπιον). The Byzantine *mitre* (μίτρα) is a metal crown, gilt, ornamented with jewels and lined with red velvet.² Bishops carry a *crozier* (δικανίκιον), which is shorter than a Latin one and which ends in two branches curved round and ornamented with serpents' heads. Between them is a cross. These are the vestments used for the Holy Liturgy and certain other great occasions, such as the blessing of the waters on the Epiphany. On less solemn occasions, such as the Divine Office, the bishop wears only the mandyas (p. 340), kalemaukion (ibid.), and a smaller staff of wood with an ivory cross piece, like the letter T. For certain other services he wears the epitachelion under and the small omophorion over the mandyas. To bless the people at the end of the liturgy he has in the right hand a triple candlestick with lighted candles (τρικήριον), and a double one (δικήριον) in the left. When a bishop is consecrated he stands on a small round carpet (ἀετός), on which are worked a city and above it an eagle surmounting the sun in its splendour.³ The *Priest's* vestments are the sticharion, epitachelion, girdle, epimanikia. If he is a dignitary of any kind he wears the epigonation too, and in Russia the Czar gives mitres to specially deserving priests. Instead of the sakkos he wears the *Phainolion* (φαινόλιον). This is a chasuble (pœnula, φαινόλης origin-

¹ The Uniate Patriarchs wear the Roman pallium on certain days as well as the omophorion.

² This mitre came into use after 1453 and was at first worn only by the Œcumenical Patriarch. The traditional story is that he took the crown of the Emperors when he was made the head of the Roman nation. It is certainly nothing but a copy of the old Imperial crown. I have an edition of the *Roman History* of Nikephoros Gregoras (Basel, 1562), with plates of Emperors in toga and crown (Palaiologoi and Komnenoi) and the crowns are exactly the Byzantine "mitre."

³ In Russia this carpet is still used by the bishop for all functions. It is another relic of the Byzantine Court; the Emperors in my Nikephoros Gregoras are all standing on cushions embroidered with eagles.

ally) which has been cut away, not at the sides as ours have, but in front. It is then a great bell-shaped vestment with a hole through which the head is put, reaching to the feet behind and at the sides, and scooped out in front up to about the waist.¹ Before all bishops used the sakkos they had specially rich phainolia covered all over with little crosses, called *Polystauria* (πολυσταύρια—many crosses). The priest has no omophorion. He wears all his vestments only for the Holy Liturgy and on a few other occasions. Generally, if he is not about to celebrate the liturgy, he wears only the epitachelion and phainolion over his cassock; so the phainolion is used as both chasuble and cope. The *Deacon* wears the sticharion and epimanikia, but no girdle. As his sticharion is always seen, it is generally more ornamented than those of the bishop and priest and it has shorter sleeves. It looks very like our dalmatic. The deacon's stole is not called epitachelion but *Orarion* (ὠράριον): it hangs from the left shoulder (to which it is pinned) straight to the ground before and behind. It is narrower than the epitachelion and usually has the word Holy (ἅγιος) embroidered on it three times. Whenever the deacon has to give a sign during the liturgy he takes the end of his orarion in the right hand and motions with it. When he goes to receive Holy Communion he winds it around his body. Other clerks wear a shorter sticharion and an orarion wound around them.² All wear the kalemaukion (hat, p. 340) with vestments out of doors, at processions, &c. They have no sort of surplice.³

The vessels used for the Holy Liturgy are the *Chalice* (ποτήριον), the *Diskos* (δίσκος), which is a paten, but much larger and deeper than ours (they use, of course, leavened bread), with a foot on

¹ Some phainolia, however, are quite long in front too, and have to be held up over the arms during the liturgy.

² This is an abuse. The Council of Laodicea (c. 360) forbade anyone below the rank of deacon to wear an orarion (Canon 22: "It is not meet for the server to wear an orarion nor to go away from the doors," Lauchert, 74).

³ For the vestments see R. Storf: *Die griechischen Liturgien*, pp. 13, 14, and especially *E. d'Or.* v. pp. 129-139; for the garments from which they were evolved, J. Wilpert: *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Köln, 1898. See also the illustration of bishop, priest, and deacon vested for the Holy Liturgy, p. 405.



INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE BYZANTINE LITURGY.

1. The Holy Bread. 2. The Paten. 3. The Asterisk. 4. The Fan.
5. The Spoon. 6. The Holy Spear. 7. The Bishop's Staff.

which to stand. It is never placed on the chalice. Then the *Asteriskos* (ἄσθηλακος), a cross of bent metal, which stands over the diskos.¹ Both chalice and diskos are covered with small veils, and a large veil, the *Aer* (ἀήρ) is then laid over both. A *spoon* is used for giving Holy Communion, and the *holy lance*, a long knife, for cutting up the bread. They have a *sponge* for purifying the diskos, and a *fan* (ῥιπίδιον), made of a long handle and a flat picture of a seraph with six wings, which the deacon waves over the Blessed Sacrament.² All these vessels stand on the prothesis (credence table) when the liturgy begins. Candles in candlesticks are carried before processions, and a thurible with incense is used continually. The *Antimension* (ἀντιμήνσιον)³ corresponds to our corporal and altar-stone. It is a square piece of linen doubled, in which are sewn up relics anointed with chrism. It is always consecrated by a bishop, and it lies folded upon the altar. The priest unfolds it during the liturgy, and folds it again at the end. It is generally ornamented with a design, representing the entombment of our Lord, with the four Evangelists and the instruments of the Passion, printed in black ink. I have seen one made of silk.⁴ There are no relics in an Orthodox altar: the antimension is really a sort of portable altar. In the diakonikon is kept a vessel of hot water during the liturgy (p. 416).

4. Church Music.

Before we come to a description of the modern Byzantine liturgy, a word about their Church music will be interesting, especially now that every one is discussing ours. The Orthodox, like the Catholics, have two kinds of Church music—plain song and figured music. But their figured music never sank to the depth of degradation from which Pope Pius X has now rescued us. No Orthodox Church under any circumstances ever has any musical instrument at all; all their music is unac-

¹ It is just a frame to keep the veil from touching the bread.

² See the illustration of the vessels and instruments.

³ ἀντιμήνσιον and ἐπιμανίκια are both hybrid words (ἀντι-mensa, ἐπί-manica).

⁴ Cf. E. d'O1., iii. pp. 193–202, *L'Antimension*.

accompanied singing. One hears the figured music almost exclusively in Slav churches, in Russia especially. It is a very dignified and ecclesiastical chant in strict counterpoint, of the type that is described as "alla cappella," and it suggests the music of the Italian masters of the 16th century.¹ Their choirs are composed of very carefully trained men and boys, who sing in eight or sixteen parts, and who have learned to command an enormous compass. And, as all the Slav peoples are born musicians, their singing is exceedingly beautiful, probably the most beautiful Church music in the world. Even the singing of Russian sailors on a man-of-war that one hears across the water on a Sunday morning, while their chaplain is celebrating the Holy Liturgy, sounds quite heavenly. But the Greeks think even that music too secular and frivolous for churches. One can imagine the feelings of a stray Greek who goes to High Mass at Dresden or Vienna to see what the Latins are doing. In Greek churches one hears only plainsong.² They ascribe their plainsong to St. John Damascene († 744), as we ours to St. Gregory the Great. They have the same eight modes as we, but they count them differently, numbering first the four authentic modes, and then the four plagal ones. The modes then correspond in this way :—

	Byzantine Modes.	Latin Modes.
Doric	1st authentic	1
Phrygian	2nd authentic	3
Lydian	3rd authentic	5
Mixolydian	4th authentic	7
Hypodoric	1st plagal	2
Hypophrygian	2nd plagal	4
Hypolydian	3rd plagal	6
Hypomixolydian	4th plagal	8 3

¹ As a matter of fact, I believe most of it was written by Italians of about that date.

² There are a few exceptions now. At the metropolitan church of Athens they are beginning to introduce polyphony. Joachim III has declared that figured music is lawful.

³ Mode in Greek is ὁ ἦχος, authentic is αὐθεντικός, plagal πλάγιος. They call the dominant τὸ ἴσον. These are the names of the notes : νη = do, πα = re, βου = mi, γα = fa, δι = sol, κε = la, ζω = si.

But there is this fundamental difference, that, whereas our plainsong is strictly diatonic, and its intervals are constant, theirs is enharmonic, and has varying intervals. Not only do they sing $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{5}{4}$ tones, but in different modes, even in the same mode, according as the melody rises or falls, the interval between two notes changes. As a specimen, this is the ascending scale of the first authentic mode, with the intervals between the notes in brackets: re ($\frac{1}{9}$), mi ($\frac{1}{1\frac{6}{8}}$), fa ($\frac{9}{8}$), sol ($\frac{1}{9}$), la ($\frac{9}{8}$), si ($\frac{1}{1\frac{6}{8}}$), do ($\frac{9}{8}$), re. When it descends the scale becomes: re ($\frac{9}{8}$), do ($\frac{1}{9}$), si ($\frac{2}{2\frac{7}{8}}$), la ($\frac{1}{9}$), sol ($\frac{9}{8}$), fa ($\frac{1}{1\frac{6}{8}}$), mi ($\frac{1}{9}$), re.¹ On the other hand, in the second plagal mode, the interval re-mi is $\frac{1}{1\frac{6}{8}}$ tone, mi-fa, $\frac{9}{8\frac{0}{3}}$, &c. To Western ears this music certainly sounds very strange and barbarous. It is much discussed whether the enharmonic intervals are really Greek, or whether they are due to later Asiatic influence. The Byzantines have other musical practices that make their singing still more unpleasant to us. They add astonishing grace notes and incredible pneumas, rushing through quarter-tones and half-quarter tones round about the note that we should expect them to hold. Their melodies continually change from one mode to another, and, as they have no accompaniment and only the vaguest pneumas printed in their books,² it is difficult for the singers to know what mode they should sing. To help them, a boy is made to sing the Ison (*ἰσον*, dominant) continuously the whole time. As soon as the mode changes, the Ison-boy is made to suddenly raise or drop his note, and the whole choir knows that they must now sing in the new mode. If anything were wanted to make this amazing chanting still more unbearable to us, it would be the continual wail of the Ison-boy piercing through the apparently irresponsible vagaries of the choir. But the Western European who has heard what seems to be simply a confused shrieking with no rhythm, tune, nor method, should know that really their chant is the most wonderful display of accurate ear and skill in the world. Who of us could sing such intervals as $\frac{9}{8\frac{0}{3}}$ tones right, or at one flash, as the Ison-boy drops his doleful

¹ Tables of all the modes, with their intervals, are given in *E. d'Or*, iii. pp. 213-215, *L'harmónique chez les Grecs modernes*.

² They have never used our system of stave-lines.

wail, calculate that he has shifted from do to la, and that, therefore, we must change from the third authentic to the first plagal mode? Pity that so much skill should be spent to produce such a hideous result. There is, however, one undoubted advantage in the Byzantine chant. There are people who can hear no tune in Latin plainsong. Such a person should frequent a Greek church for a time, and then come back to one of ours. If, after their incredible wailing, he can still find no melody in our *Tantum Ergo* or *Veni, Creator*, he must give up looking for tune in anything.¹

5. The Holy Liturgy.

The Byzantine rite consists of three liturgies : first, the older and longer liturgy of *St. Basil*, now used only on the Sundays of Lent (except Palm Sunday), Maundy Thursday, and Holy Saturday, the Eves of Christmas and the Epiphany, and on *St. Basil's* feast (January 1st). On all other days the liturgy of *St. John Chrysostom* (a shortened form of that of *St. Basil*) is used, when the holy Sacrifice is offered at all. But on the week-days of Lent (except on Saturdays) no Mass may be said. On these days, then, the Liturgy of the Presanctified (ἡ τῶν προηγιασμένων), attributed to *St. Gregory Dialogos* (our *St. Gregory the Great*) is used.² But the Holy Liturgy is not celebrated every day. An Orthodox priest says Mass only on Sundays and greater feast-days. Nor is it said more than once on the same day at the same altar (p. 404). Where many priests are present they all celebrate together, and the rite of concelebration, which we have only at ordinations, may be seen almost every time a Byzantine bishop says Mass. It would be long to give an exact account of all these three liturgies.³ An outline

¹ Gaisser, *Le système musical*, &c., gives specimens of Byzantine chants as far as they can be expressed on our stave, with additional marks for raising or lowering notes by $\frac{1}{4}$ -tone, and explains the whole system.

² It is doubtful whether any of these liturgies were really composed by the Saints whose names they bear ; that of *St. Gregory* certainly was not. In the Latin Church, too, the Mass of the Presanctified, now said only on Good Friday, was once used constantly throughout the year (*Cf. Duchesne : Origines*, pp. 222, 239).

³ The texts of them will be found in the books quoted in the list (p. xxvi., *seq.*).

of the service of the common one—that of St. John Chrysostom—will be enough here. The first rubric tells the priest that if he is about to celebrate the holy Mysteries he must, above all things, be reconciled to all men, keep his heart from evil thoughts, and fast from the evening before. The priest and deacon begin by making three reverences towards the Ikonostasis, and then say the preparatory prayers¹ in the choir. When they have said these prayers and have kissed the holy pictures (the rubric says all the pictures) they bow to the choir and go through the deacon's door to the Diakonikon. Here they vest, the priest blessing each vestment, and both say the prayers appointed.² They wash their hands, saying the same part of the 25th psalm as we do (verses 6–12, *Lavabo*), and then go across to the Prothesis, where the deacon has already laid the vessels and the bread and wine. Here begins the first part of the liturgy, the *Preparation of the Offering*. The bread is a round loaf marked with divisions, the parts to be consecrated have a cross between the letters IC. XC. NI. KA (*Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς νικᾷ*, Jesus Christ conquers).³ The priest takes the holy lance and cuts away this part and stabs it in the form of a cross, saying, “The Lamb of God is sacrificed,” &c. This part of the bread is then commonly called the Lamb. The deacon pours wine and water into the chalice. The priest then cuts away a particle from the rest of the bread in honour of our Lady, and nine others for various Saints, and others for the bishop and Orthodox clergy and for people for whom he wishes to pray. These particles (*προσφορά*) are placed on the diskos by the Lamb, covered with the aer and veils, as well as the chalice, and are all repeatedly incensed.⁴ The deacon then incenses the prothesis, altar, sanctuary, nave, and priest. They

¹ Brightman, pp. 353–354.

² Ibid. pp. 354–356.

³ See the figure of the holy bread in the illustration, p. 409. The triangle marked on the left is the portion of the Mother of God, the others are those for the Saints.

⁴ Meanwhile, a series of prayers are said: Brightman, pp. 356–362. There is a long rubric explaining how the *prophora* are to be arranged around the Lamb. At one time, the Orthodox Church was torn by controversy on this point. The portion for the Mother of God should be at the right, because of the verse: “The queen stands at thy right hand.” But they could not make up their minds which is the right side. Now they have settled it is the left of the priest who faces the bread.

both go to the altar, kiss the book of Gospels on it, and the deacon, holding up his orarion, says, "It is time to do sacrifice to the Lord."¹ Here begin the *litanies* (συναπταί). The doors of the Ikonostasis are opened, and the deacon goes out into the choir through the north (servers') door. They stay open while he recites a litany praying for various causes—for peace, for the Church, bishop, king, fruits of the earth, travellers, sailors, prisoners, &c. Then follows the first Antiphon,² and the priest says a collect. The second litany is shorter; the deacon remembers our Lady and the Saints, and the choir answers Kyrie eleison, and "To you, Lord (be honour)." They sing a second Antiphon, and the priest says a second collect. The same thing is then repeated a third time.³ The *Mass of the Catechumens* now begins with what is called the *little entrance* (μικρὰ εἰσοδός). The deacon has gone back to the priest's side in the sanctuary before the third collect. They come out, the deacon holding the gospels, preceded by candle-bearers in procession. The troparia of the day (short hymns) are sung, ending with the Trisagion.⁴ The priest, as always, is saying other prayers while the choir sings. A reader sings the epistle, and the deacon the gospel of the day, having incensed the book. There is a gradual after the epistle, and some more prayers after the gospel. Then follow prayers for the catechumens, and they are dismissed by the deacon: "All catechumens go out. Catechumens go out. All catechumens go away. Not one catechumen (shall stay)."⁵ Here begins the *Mass of the Faithful*. The deacon says: "All the faithful again and again pray to the Lord in peace," and repeats several times the curious exclamation: "Wisdom!"⁶

¹ For a detailed account of the Preparation, see *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 65-78, *La préparation des oblats dans le rite grec.*

² On ordinary Sundays it is *Psa. cii.*

³ The third Antiphon on Sundays consists of part of the Beatitudes with other Stichera (short verses).

⁴ This is what we sing on Good Friday: "Holy God, holy strong One, holy immortal One, have mercy on us," three times, followed by the Gloria Patri, Sicut erat, and then again "Holy immortal One, have mercy on us," and lastly, the whole first verse: "Holy God," &c.

⁵ Of course, there are no catechumens present at all. For the prayers said by the priest, &c., see Brightman, pp. 362-375.

⁶ The ejaculation "Wisdom!" occurs often. Before the gospel, the deacon says: "Wisdom! stand up (σοφία ὁρθοί)."

There are other prayers, and then the choir sings the *Cherubikon*, "Let us, who mystically represent the Cherubim and who sing to the life-giving Trinity the thrice-holy hymn, put away all earthly cares so as to receive the King† of all things escorted by the army of angels. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia." During this hymn, at the point marked †, the *Great Entrance* takes place. This is the dramatic moment of the whole liturgy. The royal doors are opened. The priest, having again incensed the altar and sanctuary, goes with the deacon to the prothesis and incenses the bread and wine, that have remained there since the beginning of the service. He covers the deacon's shoulders with the aer (great veil), and gives him the diskos with the bread, covered with its own smaller veil. The deacon holds the diskos as high as his head, and the censor hangs from one of his fingers. The priest follows with the chalice and its veil. Candle-bearers go in front and form a solemn procession. They come out of the north door and go all round the church, coming back to the sanctuary through the royal doors. At the altar the priest puts down the chalice, takes the diskos from the deacon, puts that down too, and incenses the offering again. Meanwhile the choir finishes the *Cherubikon*.¹ The priest and deacon say some more prayers for each other and that God may accept their sacrifice, and then the deacon cries out: "The doors, the doors. Let us attend in wisdom," and the doors of the Ikonostasis are shut. A reader then says the Nicene Creed outside.² Here begins the *Anaphora* (Canon of the Mass). The priest blesses the people and the choir answers through the closed doors: "And with thy Spirit." *Pr.* "Lift up your hearts." *Ch.* "We have them with the Lord." *Pr.* "Let us give thanks to the Lord." *Ch.* "It is meet and just to adore the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one consubstantial and undivided Trinity."³ *Pr.* "It is meet and just to sing to

¹ All this ritual, and especially the *Cherubikon*, with its reference to the King of all things, before the Consecration, show that the Byzantine Church has the same dramatic representations as the Latins (p. 387). The Orthodox then are ill-advised in making an argument from the *Epiklesis* for their theory. Their *Cherubikon* answers that.

² Brightman, pp. 375-383.

³ The deacon here waves the fan (*ripidion*) over the offering.

thee, to bless thee, praise thee, and give thanks to thee in all places" And so the Eucharistic prayer continues. This first part (our Preface) never changes in the Byzantine rite. It is said silently by the priest, and he only raises his voice at the words : "Crying, singing, proclaiming the hymn of victory and saying : " *Ch.* "Holy, holy, holy," &c. ; just as in our Mass. At the end of a short prayer the priest says the words of institution aloud, and each time the choir answers Amen.¹ After another short prayer,² comes the Epiklesis (p. 386, n. 3), the deacon each time saying : "Bless, Master, the holy bread," or "the holy chalice," and waving the ripidion. The deacon incenses the Blessed Sacrament, and the royal doors are thrown open. Then comes the memory of the living and dead, a blessing of the people, and the doors are shut. After another litany (for which the deacon goes out into the choir), a reader says the Our Father. The doors are opened, the deacon arranges his orarion around his body, goes back to the altar, and says, "Let us attend." Then the priest slightly elevates the diskos and chalice, saying, "Holy things to the holy," and the choir goes on, "One only is holy, one only Lord, Jesus Christ in the glory of the Father. Amen." The doors are again shut. The priest breaks the Host by the crosses on it, and says, "The Lamb of God is broken and distributed," &c. He then puts the fractions marked IE. into the chalice and the deacon pours in a little hot water.³ The choir sings the kinonikon (a short verse), and the priest comes to the communion. He says : "Behold I come to Christ, our immortal King and God," takes a part marked XC., says : "The precious and most holy Body of Jesus Christ, Lord and God and Saviour, is given to me, N., priest, for the forgiveness of my sins, and for life everlasting," and receives Holy Communion. He then gives communion in

¹ The Uniate Euchologion prints the words of institution in capitals (*μικρὸν εὐχολόγιον*, Rome, 1872, p. 39), and the Uniates make a prostration after saying them. The Orthodox books print them straight on in the same type, and add as a footnote the rubric quoted on p. 387.

² The *ἀναμνήσεις*, memory of our Lord's passion death, resurrection, and ascension (our Unde et Memores).

³ This rite of adding hot water to the chalice is a very old peculiarity of the Byzantine Liturgy.

the form of bread to the deacon, and the same ceremony with similar words is used for the chalice. After a prayer of thanksgiving the doors are opened, the deacon shows the people the chalice, and says : "Approach with fear of God, faith and love," and the priest blesses them. It is at this moment that on the rare occasions when people receive Holy Communion (four times a year among the Orthodox) the priest goes down to the royal doors and distributes it. They receive it under both kinds ; the priest takes with a spoon part of the Host which is in the chalice, and therefore soaked in the consecrated wine, and gives it to the communicant, saying : "The servant of God, N., receives the holy and precious Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, Lord, God, and Saviour, for the forgiveness of his sins, and for life everlasting." When he goes back to the altar, the deacon, with a sponge, puts all the prosphora of the Saints into the chalice.¹ After incensing the chalice he carries it back to the prothesis.²

Here begins the last part, the *Dismissal*. The deacon loosens his orarion and goes back to the choir, where he chants a short litany with the singers. The priest then also comes out and says a prayer before the image of our Lord on the Ikonostasis. The deacon goes to the prothesis and consumes all that is left of the Holy Eucharist (with the prosphora). Meanwhile some bread was left over when the offerings were first prepared (p. 413) and has stayed on the prothesis ever since. This is now brought to the priest, blessed and given to the people as blessed bread (*ἀντίδωρον, pain bénit*).

¹ One of the great questions is whether these prosphora, which were broken off from the bread at the beginning (p. 413) and which have lain on the disks ever since, are consecrated (p. 392). The Orthodox now say they are not consecrated, and their deacons put them into the chalice after the Communion. At one time they were certainly put in before, and given to the people as communion. So if the Orthodox are right, those people formerly received Holy Communion under one kind only—of wine. It is really only a question of the priest's intention. The Uniates are bound to intend to consecrate all the bread on the disks (by Benedict XIV), the prosphora of the Saints are put in the chalice immediately after the priest's communion, and the laity are communicated with them. See the discussion of the whole question in *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 71-73 (*l.c.*).

² Brightman, pp. 383-397.

After a few more prayers, the priest and deacon go to the diakonikon, the doors are again shut, and they take off their vestments. They make a short thanksgiving, and the liturgy is over.¹ The Byzantine Liturgy takes two or three hours to celebrate. It is undoubtedly a very splendid and majestic service, and the prayers (the Preface especially) often reach a very high point of emotional poetry. Is it Latin prejudice that makes one think our shorter Mass, at the open altar, with its absence of all emotionalism, its simple ceremonies, and sternly reticent prayers, more dignified?²

6. Other Rites; the Sacraments.

The *Divine Office* in the Byzantine Church is a very complicated thing. There is no Breviary, so the different parts have to be read from the various books described above (p. 401). It is also enormously long. To sing the whole office for one day is said to take about eight hours. The merest outline of this office will be enough here. Like the Western hours it consists essentially of psalm-singing. The psalter is divided into twenty parts (*καθίσματα*), containing from four to eight psalms each,³ and it is sung right through in a week. The office also contains collects, prayers, litanies and an immense variety of hymns and antiphons, such as the *Heirmos* (*εἰρμός*), which is a hymn having a tune of its own, the *Troparion* (*τροπάριον*), which is sung to the tune of its heirmos, the *Kontakion* (*κοντάκιον*), a short hymn about the feast of the day, the *Oikos* (*οἶκος*), which is joined to the Troparion to develop the ideas

¹ That is only an outline of the service. All the time prayers, hymns, and antiphons are being said and sung, of which the text will be found in Brightman.

² The Orthodox have no provision for Low Mass. Where there is no deacon the priest has to supply the deacon's part and manage as best he can. But, as they only celebrate on Sundays and feast-days, they have less need for any service like our Low Mass. The Uniates have provided for it though. The Greek College at Rome has a number of little manuscript books containing a ritual for the liturgy when there are only a priest and a server. In 1893 I was allowed to copy this book, and I have served "low" Uniate liturgies from it. But the whole thing is much less defined than our Low Mass. For the liturgy see Kattenbusch : *Confessionskunde*, i. pp. 491-498.

³ The numbers exactly in Nilles : *Kalendarium*, I. liv.

suggested by the feast, the *Sticheron* (στιχηρόν), a hymn for matins and vespers, &c., &c.¹ The hours are the *Night Office* (μεσονύκτιον, Matins), *Orthros* (ὄρθρος, Lauds), *Prime*, *Terce*, *Sexte*, and *None* (ὥρα πρώτη, τρίτη, ἕκτη, ἐνάτη), *Hesperinon* (ἑσπερινόν, Vespers) and *Apodeipnon* (ἀπόδειπνον, Compline). There are further shorter offices, called *Mesoora* (μεσώρα), to be said between the day hours and between None and Vespers.² Because of its great length the whole office is only said by monks, in choir, and they have to get through a great part of it by very quick recitation. Secular priests say such parts as their devotion prompts and time allows.³ Leaving out what would be a very dull catalogue of psalms and complicated antiphons, we will quote instead two famous hymns of the Byzantine Office. The first is the *Hymnos Akathistos* (ὕμνος ἀκάθιστος). This is a whole office in honour of our Lady, and in memory of her Annunciation. It was probably composed in the 7th century,⁴ and it is always printed at the end of the Horologion. They sing it with great solemnity on the Saturday before the second Sunday before Easter (our Passion Sunday) and they sing parts of it every Friday evening and Saturday morning during Lent. It is always to be said standing (hence the name Akathistos—the Standing Hymn). The troparia, kontakia, stichera, &c., of which it is made up are superbly beautiful hymns to our Lady, of which we, by the way, might have translations to sing instead of the hymns people make up now.⁵ “Honoured above the Cherubim, more glorious than the Seraphim, bearing the incarnate Word, Mother of God, we

¹ The *Kirchenlexicon*, ii. pp. 1278–1279 (Freiburg, 1883), describes twenty-two of these different kinds of chant.

² A description of the hours will be found in the *Kirchenlexicon*, ii. pp. 1279–1283.

³ The Uniate secular clergy are allowed to leave out most of their office too. Every now and then some of them ask at Rome what they are to do, and the S. Congregation of Rites always answers: *Servetur consuetudo*. They simply cannot say it all.

⁴ The Orthodox attribute it to Photius.

⁵ The whole office is published with an Italian translation by Dom P. de Meester, O.S.B.: *Officio dell' inno acatisto*. Benedict XIV has granted indulgences to all the faithful of whatever rite who devoutly say it (*ibid.* xv–xvi).

praise thee." "The great Angel was sent from heaven to bring his message to the Mother of God, and he, wondering that the Lord of all things should take a human body, greeted her with angelic words. Hail, cause of our joy ; hail, end of the curse of Adam ; hail, throne of the King ; hail, bearer of him who bears all things. Spouse and Virgin, Hail." ¹ The other famous hymn of the Byzantine office is the *Phos hilaron* (Φῶς ἡλαρόν). It is certainly as old as the 3rd century, and is attributed to Athenogernes (a martyr of the 2nd century, whose feast they keep on July 16).² It is sung every day at the end of Vespers, as the last rays of the sun disappear : "Kindly light of the Father's glory, blessed and holy Jesus Christ, now that we see the setting sun and light the evening lamps, again we worship God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. At all times it is right to praise thee, Son of God and Life-giver, and so the whole world shall always tell thy glory." ³

There are certain differences in the administration of the *seven great Mysteries*.⁴ The Orthodox always *baptize* by immersion. The priest first anoints the limbs and then dips the child three times, having turned its face to the East. Meanwhile he says the form : "The servant of God, N., is baptized in the name of the Father, Amen, and of the Son, Amen, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." ⁵ They think baptism by immersion so necessary that they doubt the validity of any other kind, and so they very much doubt our baptism. All the Greek-speaking Orthodox rebaptize any convert who comes to them from the Latins or Protestants. But the Church of Russia has officially declared that she has no such doubt and that she will not do so.⁶ Of

¹ De Meester, pp. 36-37.

² Nilles, i, p. 213.

³ Nilles, i., pp. lv-lvi. F. Cabrol : *Le livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 1900), pp. 142, 560, &c.

⁴ In the Euchologion they follow the three liturgies (Venetian ed. 1898, pp. 136-288).

⁵ The whole rite in the Euch. (ed. cit.), pp. 136-144.

⁶ *E. d'Or.* vii. p. 93, &c. A synod of Constantinople, in 1756, commanded all Latins who should join the Orthodox Church to be rebaptized (*E. d'Or.* ii. p. 131). In 1718, however, a Patriarchal constitution had declared baptism by infusion to be valid (*ibid.* p. 132). The whole question is in the usual Orthodox muddle. They have contradicted themselves on this point backwards and forwards again in 1860, 1875, 1878 and 1888 (*ibid.* pp. 134-135).

course, if our baptism is not valid we can have no valid Sacraments, our Orders, Penance, and Eucharist are alike vain. So it would hardly seem worth while making so much fuss about our form of Consecration. Only in this point again one has to notice the vagueness and inconsistency of their ideas. All through their theology one is struck by an indefiniteness and a want of method that would be inconceivable to Catholic theologians. Although they have not, as we shall see, our idea of the indelible character of the three Sacraments, at any rate when once they are sure of valid baptism they do not repeat it.¹ *Confirmation* is administered by the priest immediately after baptism. The whole body is anointed with chrism, and the priest says the form: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Amen." It should be noted that we recognize this as valid confirmation, our Uniates do so too, and no Latin bishop ever thinks of reconfirming a convert from Orthodoxy.² But the Orthodox do not believe that the character of confirmation is indelible: two sins and two only can efface it—heresy and schism. Confirmation is the regular means by which any one is received into their communion, not only Latins and Uniates, but even people who were originally baptized and confirmed Orthodoxly, and who have since fallen away.³ We have seen how the *Holy Eucharist* is administered in churches. The pious layman goes to communion four times a year—at Christmas, Easter, Whit Sunday and on the falling asleep of the Mother of God (August 15th). The Blessed Sacrament is reserved for the

¹ They have, however, sometimes done even this (*E. d'Or.* ii. p. 135); it is the case of an Orthodox Russian in Syria who turned Catholic (of course we did not rebaptize him), went back, and was rebaptized by them!

² This fact ought to sufficiently answer the question whether a priest can validly confirm. It is known that the Pope gives leave to do so to certain Latin priests in missions. But he cannot by an act of jurisdiction give them any new *potestas ordinis*. It seems certain then that every priest has the power of confirming, although in the Latin Church they are not allowed to use it, just as a layman may not baptize except in case of necessity. The bishop is the *ordinary* minister of Confirmation.

³ This reconfirmation is an innovation. The Greek Fathers taught that the character of confirmation is indelible, just as did the Latin Fathers. See the quotations in *E. d'Or.* ix. pp. 65-76: *La reconfirmation des apostats dans l'Église gréco-russe.*

sick, more or less under both kinds, that is to say, that the Host that has been dipped into the chalice is taken out and kept in another chalice, where, of course, it becomes quite dry. It is given to the sick in a spoon with the usual form (p. 417). The chalice containing the Holy Eucharist is kept in a small tabernacle (*ἀρτοφόριον* or *ἱεροφολάκιον*) on the prothesis or on the altar. It is curious that they seem to take no notice of the Real Presence in their churches.¹ I have seen an Orthodox priest walk straight in front of his artophorion without paying the slightest attention to it. When one sees the enormous reverence they pay to the holy pictures, the burning lamps, prostrations, kissing and signs of the Cross they make before them, one realizes how little they trouble to be logical in their religious customs.² The Sacrament of *Penance* (*μετάνοια*) is administered as rarely as Holy Communion, usually only on the same four occasions. It takes a much less important place in their religious life than in ours. They have no confessionals. The ghostly father (*πνευματικός*) sits before the Ikonostasis under the picture of our Lord. The penitent kneels before him and several prayers are said, to which the rubric orders the choir to answer *Kyrie eleison* (!).³ "Then the ghostly father says with a cheerful voice: Brother, be not ashamed that you come before God and before me, for you do not declare to me, but to God, who is present here." He then asks the penitent all his sins, reminds him that only God can forgive them, but that our Lord gave this power to his Apostles saying: "Whose sins you shall forgive," &c., and finally absolves them in a prayer, of which the essential form is: "May this same God, through me a sinner, forgive you all both now and for ever," and he goes on: "May he set you without blame before his holy altar, and have no more care for the sins you have declared. Go in

¹ The Blessed Sacrament is not reserved in nearly all churches. They have no such rites as our Benediction or Procession of the Blessed Sacrament.

² This can be explained. All these reverences to holy pictures are ancient customs that grew up when reservation was hardly known. The conservative Easterns keep to the old customs, and dislike new ones, however much the situation may be now changed.

³ The "choir" must be really the penitent.

peace.”¹ From which it will be seen that the Byzantine Church absolves with a deprecatory form.

Holy Order (χειροτονία) is conferred by laying on the right hand only. The forms are: for the deacon, “The grace of God, that always strengthens the weak, and fills the empty, appoints the most religious subdeacon N. to be deacon. Let us then pray for him, that the grace of the Holy Ghost may come to him.”² The ordaining bishop goes on with a long prayer full of allusions to the diaconate, St. Stephen, &c., still holding his hand on the subject’s head. He then vests the new deacon and gives him an horarion and a ripidion. The ordination of a priest takes place in the same way, with the obvious difference in the form (“the most religious deacon N. to be priest”) and in the allusions of the prayer. The priest also receives his vestments and instruments.³ The bishop is ordained with a slightly longer form, which, however, includes the same words: “appoints the most religious elect N. to be Metropolitan of the most holy Metropolis N. Let us then pray for him, &c.” And there follows the ordination prayer, after which he receives the omophorion.⁴ Only the Patriarch or his deputy may ordain bishops. Priests and bishops concelebrate at once with the ordainer. The Orthodox believe that the grace of holy orders, like that of confirmation, may be entirely lost through heresy or schism. This fact, besides our doubtful baptism, would make our orders invalid. And there are cases in which they have reordained not only Latin priests, but even Uniates who had received holy orders according to exactly the same form as the Orthodox.⁵ But the Russians have declared that they recognize our orders as well as our baptism, and that they will neither rebaptize nor ordain Latins.⁶ Nor do any of the Orthodox really straightforwardly say that all our orders are

¹ Euch. (ed. cit.), pp. 221–223.

² The whole service in the Euch. 160–163.

³ Euch. 163–166.

⁴ Ibid. 166–168, 169–176, 176–181. While he is being ordained bishop the subject stands and kneels on the Aetos (p. 407).

⁵ In 1840 Makarios, Uniate Metropolitan of Diarbekir, left the Catholic Church and joined the Orthodox. He was rebaptized, reconfirmed, and received all the orders again (*E. d’Or.* ii. p. 132).

⁶ *E. d’Or.* vii. p. 93.

invalid. It would be rather too wild a statement, and in this point, once more, they have not quite the courage of their convictions. They do not seriously make this charge against us in their controversy¹—it would be a very much more serious one than the Filioque, Azyme bread, or celibacy, and, as far as my experience goes, the average Orthodox theologian, if directly asked about it, hesitates, is obviously embarrassed,² and eagerly turns the conversation on to our creed-tampering habits. He will talk about that without end. Really in the questions of our baptism and holy orders they do not know what they believe. They often repeat both Sacraments to Latin converts, apparently chiefly as a mark of general scorn for Popery; sometimes they do not do so, and they shirk a plain statement about it. Once more, it is quite useless to look for consistent dogmatic theology among them. The salient feature of the Sacrament of *Matrimony* (γάμος) is the crowning of the spouses,³ whence the service is sometimes called the crowning (στεφάνωμα)⁴; the husband and wife wear their crowns for a week, and have a special service for taking them off at the end.⁵ Marriage is forbidden within the seventh degree, as well as between those who are spiritually or legally (by adoption) related. The Orthodox Church dislikes third marriages. A fourth is absolutely forbidden.⁶ But marriage is not absolutely indissoluble, and divorce is granted in the case of adultery.

They call the Anointing of the Sick *Euchelaion* (εὐχέλαιον), but they resent the name *extreme* Unction, and accuse us of not

¹ Anthimos VII, in his answer to Leo XIII (p. 435), said everything he could against us, but he did not dispute the *validity* of our baptism, and he said nothing about our orders.

² On one occasion all that the most strenuous efforts could get out of an Orthodox protopope was that God knows—which is perfectly true.

³ They use little brass crowns, which look unspeakably absurd. It appears to be not uncommon for the priest, when he marries people, to be convulsed with laughter at the appearance of the bridegroom in a dress suit and a brass crown.

⁴ The nuptial service in the Euch. 238–241, the crowning that follows it at once, 241–252.

⁵ Euch. 252.

⁶ We saw how much trouble the fourth marriage of the Emperor Leo VI caused (p. 167). Even second marriages are not crowned.

conferring this Sacrament till all hope of the sick man's recovery is over. The accusation is false ; one of the objects for which we anoint the sick, distinctly expressed in our prayers at the time, is that "the prayer of faith may save the sick man and the Lord may raise him up." They require seven priests to administer the Euchelaion,¹ and again reproach us that we have only one, in spite of the plural in St. James's Epistle : "Let him call in the priests of the Church" (verse 14). The matter is olive oil, with which they often mix wine² (in memory of the Good Samaritan) ; it is not blessed by the bishop, but by the priests just before it is used. They have a long form invoking our Lady, the holy "moneyless physicians" SS. Cosmas and Damian, and other Saints ; they anoint the forehead, chin, cheeks, hands, nostrils, and breast with a brush, and each priest present does the same. Their service is, as usual, very long ; it lasts two or three hours. And they anoint not only the very sick, but people quite slightly unwell, and regularly on certain days of the year every one, even people who are in quite good health, as a preparation for Holy Communion.³ A Sacramental connected with this Sacrament is the anointing of persons with oil taken from a lamp that burns before some holy picture. In doing so the priest, by some strange confusion, sometimes uses the form of Confirmation : "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost."⁴ The *holy chrism* (μύρον) used for Confirmation and other consecrations is, as we have seen (p. 284), a subject of very angry dispute. The Œcumenical Patriarch thinks that he alone should bless it for the whole Orthodox world. Its composition is enormously complicated, and certain chemists of Constantinople are officially appointed to prepare it. Besides olive oil and balsam, fifty-five other substances are put into it, among which are red wine, orange and rose-water, mastic,

¹ A less number, or even one will do in case of necessity.

² In Russia always.

³ In Russia only the Metropolitans of Moscow and Novgorod do this on Maundy Thursday. But priests in their faculties are expressly forbidden to administer the Euchelaion to people who are not sick. See *E. d'Or*, ii. pp. 193-203 : *L'extrême-onction chez les Grecs*. The rite in the Euch. 260-288.

⁴ *E. d'Or*. ii. p. 202, note 4.

various gums, nuts, pepper, flowers, and ginger.¹ It is made in huge vats and blessed on Maundy Thursday.² The whole process is so complicated and expensive that chrism is made and blessed only on rare occasions.³ Besides the Antidoron given out at the end of the Holy Liturgy, they have another kind of blessed bread called a *kolyba* (κόλυβα). Kolybas are blessed solemnly and distributed, either in honour of some Saint on his feast or in memory of some other kind of dead person. St. Augustine's reference to the funeral feast—originally food offered to the Manes of the dead—is well known (Conf. vi. 2).⁴ The Euchologion contains a great number of blessings for various occasions, of which the most famous is the *blessing of the waters* (the sea or nearest river) in memory of our Lord's baptism on the Epiphany. The bishop throws a cross into the water, and the faithful dive in and fight for it down below. The man who succeeds in getting it then comes out and makes a collection. They have many exorcisms too. The Orthodox *fast* is a very serious thing indeed. It means really only one meal a day, and involves abstinence not only from meat but from butter, milk, cheese, eggs, oil, and fish as well. The only things left are bread, olives, fruit, and wine. But all the fasts except Lent are relaxed, and even in Lent the average Orthodox layman no more fasts than the average Catholic. It is bad for his health, and makes him feel hungry. So he asks for a dispensation. But they usually keep the abstinence, and on the whole there is much more fasting and abstaining with them than with us.⁵ And an Orthodox monastery in Lent is a living example of what the fasting of the first centuries was. Until quite lately the art of *preaching* was an almost unknown thing in the Orthodox Church—strange development among the successors of St. John Chrysostom. However, in 1893 a society

¹ The complete list in *E. d'Or.* iii. pp. 129-142 : *Composition et consécration du saint-chrême.*

² Euch. 156-160.

³ Between 1850 and 1900 only four times—in 1856, 1865, 1879, and 1890 (*E. d'Or.*, *l.c.*).

⁴ Cf. *E. d'Or.* ii. pp. 321-331 : *La grand controverse des Colybés.* There was a great quarrel at Mount Athos about the kolybas.

⁵ Every Wednesday and Friday is a day of abstinence from flesh meat.

called the Eusebeia (εὐσέβεια, piety), composed chiefly of laymen, was formed at Smyrna to send preachers and catechists around to the parishes. Mr. Gregory Vaphides was its first president, and then Lord Basil Chariupolis, Metropolitan of Smyrna, consented to take that place. The Society had a great success. Its preachers spoke in churches, schools, even in the streets, and they taught children the catechism. Other metropolitans wrote approving letters about it and all was going well, when the Phanar took fright. The Eusebeia was suspected of protestantizing tendencies, and most of its preachers were laymen. Lord Germanos Karavangelis, who is now slaying Bulgars at Kastoria, but who was then Chorepiscopus of Pera, had taken up its cause. The Phanar then published in its organ (Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια, September 27, 1897) a public reprimand to him in the sharpest terms, ending: "Let His Beatitude be content to do his own duties faithfully; to go beyond them is neither virtuous nor praiseworthy." However, the Eusebeia still exists, though with diminished reputation.¹ The *funeral service* begins at the dead man's house, goes on in the church, and ends at the grave.² The dead are usually carried on an open bier, the face uncovered,³ and a long procession of friends, relations, and clergy in kalemaukion and phainolion follows, singing the Trisagion. And after her children are dead the Orthodox Church does not forget them, but continually offers the holy Sacrifice for the repose of their souls, while their friends eat kolybas for the same intention.

Summary.

In spite of its great inconvenience all the Orthodox countries still use the Julian Calendar. Their ecclesiastical year begins

¹ See the article on the Eusebeia in the *Κωνσταντινούπολις* for August 3, 1897, also *E. d'Or.* i., pp. 36-39, and Gelzer: *Geistl. u. Weltl.*, pp. 76-82.

² The funeral service (ἀκολουθία νεκρωσιμός) in the Euch. 393-420; for monks, 421-437; for priests, 437-470.

³ A Greek is carried to the grave in his boots, so as to be ready for his long journey; and at any rate in some of the islands (Euboia, &c.) he has in his right hand a coin to pay Charon—so tenacious are religious customs. Sometimes the coin becomes a disc with the holy name stamped on it—one more example of the usual evolution.

on September 1st ; it contains four great fasts, of which, however, only Lent is strictly kept. There is the same fundamental cycle of feasts as with us, although some of the feasts have different names. The most striking differences are that our Trinity Sunday is their All Saints, and that they have two All Souls' days—the Saturdays before Sexagesima and Whit Sunday. They have ten service books, very complicated and difficult to use. In all their churches a great screen cuts off and hides the sanctuary. Each of their vestments corresponds to one of ours, but they look quite different. They also need many more instruments for the holy liturgy than we do. Byzantine plain-song is enharmonic, and so sounds weird and unpleasant to us. The Holy Liturgy is said according to two different rites, and there is a third for the Mass of the Presanctified in Lent. The common use is that of St. John Chrysostom, a long and elaborate service of which the most striking feature is the Great Entrance, a procession of the oblations round the church just before they are consecrated. They baptize by immersion, rarely hear confessions, give Holy Communion under both kinds, confirm by the priest immediately after baptism, ordain by laying on one hand only, crown the spouses at marriage, and anoint not only the sick but even people in good health, by seven priests. They doubt our baptism, holy orders, and holy Eucharist. Chrism is a mixture of many substances. They have two kinds of blessed bread and many sacramentals. At the Epiphany they solemnly bless the waters ; they fast much more than we do, hardly ever have sermons, and constantly offer the holy Sacrifice for the faithful departed.

CHAPTER XIV

THE QUESTION OF REUNION

AT the end of all our account the question that will finally interest Catholics is that of reunion between this great Eastern Church and the Holy See. What hope is there that the schism, now a thousand years old, may be undone? That such a reunion would be an untold blessing both to them and to us is obvious. For the Orthodox of course the essential point of all is that they would then once more be joined to the communion of the Church of Christ. And even from their point of view one would imagine that they must feel uncomfortable, separated from the great Western See which, even now, they acknowledge as the first of the thrones. What has become of the Pentarchy, the union of the five Patriarchs, of which they have always made so much? Were it only one of the smaller ones, but it is the first of the great five who stands on one side with his vast army of followers, and the other four, who together can muster only about a third of the millions who stand by Old Rome, are cut away from their natural leader. And we can imagine what their own Fathers would say to the Orthodox if they came back. We have seen what Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodore of Studium have to say about the primacy of Old Rome. We have heard what the Fathers of Chalcedon cried out, and we have seen the Roman legates preside over other councils. If the great Fathers whom they honour could come back and see the troubles that beset their children now, what could they suggest except that a

council should be summoned and that the successor of St. Peter should send his legates to make peace among them? And what would they say when they heard that for ten centuries their Churches had rejected the communion of the See of Peter? "Now is the acceptable time," St. Theodore might well again say, "that we should unite ourselves with Rome, the summit of the Churches of God."¹ And indeed it is an acceptable time. Never yet have the Eastern bishops stood so much in need of their natural arbitrator as now. We have seen how their independence of their chief has ended in the most servile dependence on secular governments; even the unbaptized tyrant who has robbed the Christian East of her lands and degrades the lawful heirs of those countries beneath the rabble he brought with him from Asia, even he has to step in to arrange their quarrels. Do they really think that Abdulhamid is the right man to decide what language shall be used for the Holy Liturgy, and what bishop shall reign in the old sees of Macedonia? Do they still, after having felt its weight for over three centuries, prefer his turban to the Pope's tiara? At any rate the Pope never filched their children, desecrated their churches, nor murdered their bishops. Who is ever going to make peace between Greek and Bulgar, Serb and Vlach? It will not be the Œcumenical Patriarch; he is the chief offender and the avowed leader of one side. Do the Slavs want a chief who will not try to rob them of their national feeling, forbid their language, and persecute their priests? Such a chief is waiting for them across the Albanian mountains and Adriatic Sea. Let them look at the Uniates and see how scrupulously their rites and languages are kept. Does the Patriarch himself feel the degradation of being continually deposed by his own metropolitans and by the Turkish Minister of Religions? There is a greater Patriarch, whom no bishop can feel it degrading to obey, who stands for the rights of old Canon Law, and whose honour is still in the firm strength of his brothers.² And for us Catholics, too, reunion would be the greatest of blessings. We want back the great sees that have stood aloof from us so long. We want the communion of the Christians to whom St. Paul

¹ Quoted p. 67,

² P. 39, note 4.

brought the faith at Ephesus and Corinth, the children of the men of Antioch who first were called by the name in which we all glory. And we need, too, the righter balance that would be restored by reunion with the Orthodox. In spite of our loyalty to our own rite, and in spite of our natural pride in being not only Catholics but Latins and members of the greatest Patriarchate, we have to realize that the Latin Church is not, has never been, the whole Body of Christ. We may forget the Uniates (it is a shameful injustice to them if we do), but we could not forget one hundred millions of Catholics of other rites. And we need their ideas, their traditions and spirit in the Church as well as our own. Their conservatism now means only fossilization; joined to our life it would be a sane and useful balance. Their love of the liturgy and dislike of innovations has something to teach our people. If we regret the too sudden way in which new devotions spread amongst us, the gradual divorce of the people from the real rites of the Church, the slight regard paid to her seasons, the exaggeration of pious fancies above the old and essential things, the abuses in such matters as indulgences, privileges, and special favours against which the Council of Trent spoke,¹ we should find the remedy of all these things in the solid piety and the unchanging loyalty towards the customs of their fathers among Eastern Christians.

And then what a vast body we should make together. Our millions joined to theirs would form indeed a mighty and compact world-Church, before which the new sects would count as almost nothing. One conceives the union of the five Patriarchs stretching across Europe as the most glorious realization of the City of God on earth; and if one remembers all the sheep that are not of this fold regretfully, if one prays that all some day may be brought back to the one fold and the one Shepherd, one thinks then of none with so much sympathy as our brothers across the Adriatic. For with them practically nothing is wrong but the schism. In the case of others, one sees so much that would have to be changed—false doctrine, reckless mutilation of the old faith, and rival conventicles. But the Eastern schism has still left us on both

¹ P. 390.

sides with the same faith in almost everything. Of course they would have to accept the whole of the Catholic faith. In that, no desire for reunion, no spirit of conciliation, can ever make the Holy See waive anything. There can be no compromise in matters of faith. But the Orthodox already have, and jealously keep, practically all that faith. As for the points they would have to concede, one cannot believe that they really think the question of the Filioque so vital, nor can they really be so unwilling to admit the special privilege of the all-holy Mother of God, to whom they are so devoted. Infallibility seems a big thing; but in this point, too, it should not be so difficult to make them see things. If God so carefully guides his Church, how can he allow the chief Patriarch to teach heresy, since he is the leader and judge of all the others? Other bishops can be put right by appeals to Rome: to whom could one appeal from the Pope? There must be a final court somewhere; no one could suggest any other than Rome, and the decision of the final court must be final. That means infallibility. Moreover, what did their fathers think when they continually appealed to Rome in questions of faith? Let the Orthodox think the same. But no one would think of asking them to accept all our ideas, our technical terms and philosophy. It would be a question of some such formulas as those of Florence again. And in all other matters there would be nothing to change. No one would dream of touching their venerable liturgies, their splendid ritual, their ancient Canon Law, or any of the customs that, maybe, would not suit us, but which evidently suit them. Not a metropolitan would be changed, not a prayer altered.¹ Still their strange chant would echo backwards and forwards through the gleaming Ikonostasis, while the deacon waves his ripidion over the Holy Gifts, and the clouds of incense are borne through the royal doors. Still the people would crowd up for the Antidoron and the Kolybas, dive for the cross at the Holy Lights, kiss each

¹ Very likely Rome would allow the Patriarch of Constantinople to keep even his title of Œcumenical Patriarch. It has become quite harmless, and only a little absurd, now that he has lost nearly all even of his lawful Patriarchate. His brother at Alexandria is Judge of the World. And if these things please them, what do they matter?

other on Easter Day, and dance for the Forerunner's birth, while the psalms from the Holy Mountain would still sound across the Ægean Sea. Communion under one kind, celibacy, and azyme bread—these are Latin customs, which they would only be asked not to call silly names when we follow them.¹ And we do not rebaptize nor reordain just for spite. But the union would be restored with that distant mighty lord whom, in spite of all, the common people still think of as a great prince in the house of God, and they would no longer suffer the shock it must now be to them when they have to sing of the primacy of the Roman See in their office.² The obstacle to reunion is chiefly their fear of being Latinized, of having to give up the rites to which they are so much attached, and then also of forsaking the faith of their fathers. And the first step towards it would be to persuade them that reunion means only going back to the state of things before the 9th century. There was then no idea of Latinizing the Eastern Churches, nor would there be now. And the faith of their fathers involves the communion of St. Peter's See.

Is there any hope? Unhappily, one cannot see any immediate prospect. A schism always becomes stronger by sheer inertia as the centuries pass; things get settled down in that state, prejudices and jealousies fossilize into principles that seem too obvious to allow discussion, immediate antiquity—the past that people know best because it is just behind them—is against reunion. The schismatical party, once reckless innovators, gradually seem to be the conservatives. It is true that, throughout the Orthodox Church, there always has been, there still is, a party friendly to Catholics, and really distressed at the schism. These people, the *Latin-favourers* (λατεινόφρονες), are a recognized feature among them. Sometimes the party has become very

¹ Nor would they have to submit to our special centralization. All our cases now go straight to Rome, and this, too, is a Patriarchal matter, not one that is involved in the Pope's universal primacy. The Eastern Churches would undoubtedly still have their own patriarchal courts to settle their own affairs, as before the schism (p. 87), and only the *causæ maiores*, the *causæ omnium maximæ*, would have to come before the Pontiff, who, as Pope, holds, not the first, but the last, court of appeal.

² Pp. 56 seq.

strong, as, for instance, during the reaction against Protestantism after poor Lukaris's catastrophe; and in quite modern times it has again come to the fore, especially in Russia. Professor Harnack says: "People who understand Russia know that there is a patriotic Russian party (or, rather, tendency) in the heart of the country, in Moscow, and among the most educated people, that hopes for an awakening of their Church in the direction of the Western Church—that is, of the Roman, not the Evangelical Communion—who work for this, and who see in it the only hope for Russia. This party manifests its ideas in writing, as far as circumstances in Russia allow, and it has already shown that it possesses men of unusual talent, warm love of their country, and undoubted devotion to the Greek Church."¹ It is from this direction, on the one hand, and from the Uniates on the other, that one hopes for the beginning of an understanding. They stretch out from either side and leave no very wide chasm between them. In feeling, sympathy, and attitude of mind there is no great difference between the Latin-favouring Orthodox and the Uniate.

And yet the men who rule the Orthodox Church have no favour for Latins. The latest events show them to be still as hard, arrogant, and bitter as their predecessors who made the schism. In 1894 Pope Leo XIII, in the evening of his long life, looked out across the world from the throne that for so many centuries has stood above all the nations. In his last testament² he spoke to us, his own Catholics, and he remembered also the great masses of Christians who have broken away from the old Church. And so he spoke to the Orthodox and Protestants as well. One would think it impossible for any one to read what were almost the last words of so great a Pope without emotion. And nothing could be kinder, more generous, more gracious than what he said to the Orthodox. There is not one harsh word, not the shadow of any blame. The Pope leaves argument about the Filioque to the theologians who are never tired of discussing it. His last message is only of peace and kindness. And so

¹ *Reden und Aufsätze*, ii. p. 279 (*Das Testament Leos XIII*).

² The encyclical *Præclara* of June 20, 1894.

he finds every courteous thing that can be said to them. He begins by remembering that "from the East salvation came and spread over the world," he remembers the antiquity and splendid history of their sees, he mentions the Greeks who sat on St. Peter's throne, and who brought honour to it by their virtue. "And no great gulf separates us ; except for a few smaller points we agree so entirely with you that it is from your teaching, your customs and rites that we often take proofs for Catholic dogma." He assures them that no Roman Pope ever wishes to lessen the rights and dignity of the other great Patriarchs ; and for all their customs "we will provide without any narrowness." He rejoices "that in our days the Easterns have become much more friendly to Catholics, and that they show kind and generous feeling towards us." And so he makes only the gentlest and warmest appeal to them to come back to union with us. One cannot understand how any one could answer such words except respectfully and courteously. Did the Orthodox bishops think it necessary to refuse the Pope's invitation, at least they might have done so without offensive words, with the respect they owe to St. Peter's successor, and in something of a like spirit of conciliation. At that time Lord Anthimos VII reigned at Constantinople, and he, together with twelve of his metropolitans, signed an answer to the Pope's encyclical.¹ Nothing can be more striking than the different tones of the two letters, nor more offensive than Anthimos's answer. The Pope had studiously avoided making any accusation against the Orthodox. Anthimos in return has nothing to say but the old list of accusations against us—the Filioque, our baptism, Azyne bread, the Epiklesis question, communion under one kind, Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception, &c. On each of these points the Patriarch repeats the arguments that their theologians have made and ours have refuted for centuries. He has nothing new to say on the subjects ; it is

¹ The text was published in the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* for September 29, 1895. It was composed by Germanos Karavangelis, then Chorepiscopus of Pera. This person since got into trouble with his own authorities (p. 427), was made Metropolitan of Kastoria, and is now one of the leaders of the Bulgarian atrocities (p. 344).

simply one more compendium of anti-Latin controversy, not even well composed.¹ And it is the only way he thinks fit to answer the Pope. Nor do false accusations ever fail in such compendia; in this one there is a monstrous travesty of the Papal claims, ending in the assertion that the Pope requires not only spiritual but also temporal supremacy over the whole Church, that he pretends to be the only representative of Christ on earth, and the only source of all grace. The tone of the letter is perhaps even more striking than the fact that Anthimos thinks such controversy a suitable answer to what Leo had said. In the first place he gives the Pope the title that is the correct one for just any bishop or metropolitan.² According to his own Orthodox Church the Roman Bishop is the successor of St. Peter and the first Patriarch, but he thinks it decent to address him just as he would address the lowest of his suffragans. He even affects to doubt that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome—a fact that the Orthodox liturgy con-

¹ See Mgr. Duchesne: *Églises séparées*, pp. 59-112: *L'encyclique du Patriarche Anthime*, p. 75, for a misquotation of Anthimos, &c. The Patriarch drags in once more a list of our customs that are different from his, and again seems to think that the one standard for the whole world is his own patriarchate. This has been their attitude ever since Cerularius, "the state of mind of an inexperienced traveller in foreign countries who thinks everything bad that is not the same as in his own home" (ibid. pp. 83-89). If it were worth while to retaliate their everlasting accusation of Papiç novelties, one could make a catalogue of their innovations too. By what right, for instance, do they change the form of baptism left by our Lord and interlace it with superfluous Amens? Why are practically all their bishops metropolitans? Why does the Patriarch of Constantinople arrogate to himself the sole right of consecrating chrism? They put hot water into the chalice, anoint people who are not sick, forbid fourth marriages, never make a secular priest a bishop, hide their altars, change their Patriarch every year or two, &c., &c. Above all, what about the crowning innovation of holy directing synods instead of a graduated hierarchy? One could find many more such novelties. But no one wishes seriously to retaliate in this way. Catholic theologians in their controversy insist on the real issue, the Primacy, and leave such mean quibbles to the Orthodox.

² *Μακαριώτατος*. The manners of the Œcumenical Patriarch inevitably remind one of the insolence of the parvenu. For all his pompous title he knows that he is the successor of the little Byzantine bishop who obeyed the Metropolitan of Heraclea, and that had it not been for a pure accident, and then for the interference of emperors in ecclesiastical affairs, that is presumably all he would be now.

tinually asserts,¹ and that none of the old Churches have ever doubted. This is a little piece of rationalism from Tübingen, of the kind that Orthodox bishops generally strongly resent in their clergy ; but anything will do here if only it is anti-papal.² Lord Anthimos then draws up his accusations in a kind of litany, of which each clause is in this pleasant form : "The Church of the seven General Councils, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, believes and confesses . . . the Papic Church (ἡ ἐκκλησία παπική) on the other hand, &c." One would not expect him in an official document to call us Catholics, but it would have been easy to find a word that is not discourteous. The Pope had spoken of the Eastern Churches ; why not, in answering, call us the Western Church ? The Latin or Roman Church would have been an inoffensive name too. "Papic" is, of course, just silly rudeness. His All-holiness of Constantinople even pretends that he despises the Pope too much to think it worth while to answer him : "We have been silent till now ; we did not deign to cast our eyes upon this Papic Encyclical, thinking it useless to speak to the deaf." Is it necessary to give more examples of the rudeness of which the Orthodox themselves have since seemed ashamed ? Pope Leo began by speaking of the dignity of those ancient Eastern Churches, from which the faith came to us. The Patriarch Anthimos begins : "The devil has prompted the Bishops of Rome to feelings of unbearable pride, through which they have introduced a number of impious novelties contrary to the Gospel."³ A comparison of the two letters, then, makes one point clear ; the Pope wrote with the most generous courtesy, the Patriarch could not even write like

¹ Nilles : *Kal.* i. pp. 107, 138, 193, &c. ; Duchesne, *o.c.* p. 124.

² One need hardly say that St. Peter's Roman episcopate is as certain as anything in the 1st century of Church history, and is now admitted by serious scholars of every religion. It should be noted that the Orthodox (Kyriakos, for instance) still print St. Andrew's name as that of the first Bishop of Constantinople. The attitude of mind that can believe that absurd legend (p. 29) and yet doubt St. Peter's Roman See is indeed astonishing.

³ Poor Anthimos, even before his Encyclical was published, was deposed by his own metropolitans. The Pope would at any rate not have tolerated that particular kind of impious novelty that really is opposed to all old Canon Law, and that is the most flagrant abuse of the Orthodox Church.

a gentleman. In this last official communication between the Churches one sees once more the old story. It is not, it has never been, Rome that is haughty or unconciliatory. Constantinople since Photius has always assumed a tone of arrogant defiance and insolent complacency that argues complete satisfaction with the horrible state of things produced by her schism. "Evidently," says Mgr. Duchesne, "they are still sore and hurt, will have nothing to do with us, and are not at all embarrassed in saying so quite plainly." One does not, then, see in the leaders of the Orthodox Church any great desire to heal this lamentable breach. And yet, one asks oneself at the end of the whole story, what real reason can there be for the schism now? One can understand the original causes. Photius was so anxious to remain Patriarch. It was so hard for him to be deposed when the Emperor and all the court were on his side. Cerularius wanted to be a sort of Pope-Emperor himself, and the Crusaders behaved so badly to the Byzantine people. But now, after all these years, who cares any longer for those quarrels? The dusts of ten centuries have gathered over Photius's unknown grave; it is nine hundred years since Cerularius, who had been so rude and insubordinate to his over-lord, went to give his account to the over-Lord of all patriarchs. Cannot one even yet let the dead bury their dead? The schism came about through the jealousies and ambitions of the old Roman court on the Bosphorus. And that court and all the Byzantine world has been dead so long. Who cares now for the Cæsar in his gorgeous palace, or for the political rivalries of Old Rome and New Rome? The Turk swept New Rome away; and only here and there a student, peering through the mists of centuries, will call up again the pale ghosts of the men who intrigued and fought, plotted and murdered around the gorgeous halls, the stately basilicas, and the crowded streets of the city whose marble quays rose above the Golden Horn. Her watchwords are silent and her causes are forgotten, as the world moves through the changing ages. But for all of us, for the children of dead New Rome as well as for us who stand around the fisherman's throne in the eternal Old Rome, there is a cause that does not die, there is a great

city of God on earth whose foundations are laid too deep, whose towers are built too high for any change to destroy her ; and there are words that do not pass away : The branch that is cut away from the vine shall wither, and : On this rock I will build my Church.

INDEX

- ABDURRAHMAN Pasha and the Roumans, 333
 Abgar the Black of Edessa, 16
 Achrida, Metropolis of Bulgaria, 317
 Actus and Potentia, 375
 Addai (Thaddeus), Apostle of Edessa, 17
 Agatho, Pope (678-681), and the Primacy, 60
 Akathistos hymnos, 419
 Alexandria, Church of, 11-15; calculates the calendar, 12; school, 11; refuses to acknowledge First Council of Constantinople, 33; influence at Rome in 4th century, 92; Primate of Alexandria deposes Patriarchs of Constantinople, 13; Melkite Primate and the schism, 187; Patriarchate now, 285-286
 Alexios IV, Emperor (†1204), 226
 Altar, 404
 Ambrose of Uskub, 326
 America, Russian Bishops in, 297
 Anaphora, 415
 Anastasis, 28
 Anatolius of Constantinople (449-458), 36, *seq.*
 Andrew, St., at Constantinople, legend, 29
 "Andrew, Acts of St.," and the B.V.M., 108
 Andronikos II, Emperor (1282-1328), 207
 Anglican orders, 261-262
 Anglicans and Orthodox, friendly relations between, 259
 Anselm, St. (†1109), and the Synod of Bari, 203
 Anthimos IV of Constantinople (†1852) and the Greek Church, 313
 Anthimos VI of Constantinople excommunicates the Bulgars (1872), 319
 Anthimos VII of Constantinople, 343; his answer to Leo XIII (1895), 435
 Antimension, 409
 Antioch, Church of, 15-21; jurisdiction in first three centuries, 16; school, 18; Melkite Primate and the schism, 188-192; Patriarchate now, 286-290
 Appeals to Rome, 67-72
 Arabs and Greeks in Syria, 287, *seq.*
 "Archbishop of Constantinople," title, 38, 340
 Argyros, 175, *seq.*
 Armenian Church, 24
 Armenians at Florence, 215
 Arsenios of the Thebais in England (1714), 257
 Arsenius III of Ipek, 307
 Artemonites, 101
 Asia, Roman civil diocese of, 23
 Asia and Constantinople, 35
 Asiatic architecture, 122
 Athanasius, St. (†397), and the Primacy, 68; and the Filioque, 380

- Athos, Mount, 357-360
 Atticus of Constantinople (†425) and Illyricum, 35
 Augustine, St. (430), on schism, 101; and the Filioque, 380
 Austria, Orthodox in, 323
 Austria-Hungary and Catholic missions, 281-283
 Azyme bread for the Holy Eucharist, 178
- BALKANS, races in the, 274-275
 Baptism, 420
 Baradaï, James, Monophysite Bishop in Syria (543), 20
 Bardas Cæsar (†866), 137
 Bari, Council of (1098), 202-204
 Barnabas, St., first Bishop of Cyprus, 47; his grave, 48
 Basel, Council of (1431), 208, *seq.*
 Basil, St. (†379), and the Primacy, 52, 55; and Purgatory, 106; his Rule, 355
 Basil I, the Macedonian, Emperor (867-880), 155, *seq.*
 Bekkos, John (John XI of Constantinople, 1274-1282), 206
 Belgrade, Metropolis of Servia, 325
 Berat, 241; rights given by, 242
 Bessarabia, Russian robbery in, 289
 Bessarion, Cardinal (†1472), 212, 218-219
 Bible societies and the Orthodox Church, 255-256
 Bishops, Orthodox, their rights, title, and dress, 350; vestments, 405
 Bogoris, Prince of Bulgaria (861), 151
 Boniface I, Pope (418-422), and the Primacy, 69; refuses to acknowledge Canon III of Constantine I, 34
 Bonn, Union conferences at (1874, 1875), 259
 Bosnia, Church of, 334-336
 Bostra, quarrel at, 35
- Bulgarian Church, 151-152, 316-323; principality, 320; memorandum of Patriarchists against, 322
 Bulgaris, Eugenios (†1800), 250
 Byzantine Church and the Primacy, 63-67; liturgy, 118-119, 396, *seq.*
 "Byzantine question," 122
 Byzantios, Cyril, of Sinai, 311
 Byzantium, *see* Constantinople
- CÆSAREA in Cappadocia, Metropolis of Pontus, 22, *seq.*
 Cæsarea in Palestine, Metropolis, 25
 Calendar of Orthodox Church, 398-401
 Carlovitz, Church of, 305
 Catholic Church, Eastern idea of, 100
 "Cause" of Son, God the Father 378-379
 Celestine I, Pope (422-432), and the Primacy, 69
 Centralization, Latin, 433, *n.* 1
 Cerularius, Michael, of Constantinople (1043-1058), 176, *seq.*; elected Primate, 176; closes Latin churches, 180; overtures to the Pope, 182; and the Roman legates, 183, 186-187; his schism, 184; and Peter III of Antioch, 190; usurps civil authority, 193; exiled, 195; death and apotheosis, 195
 Cetinje, Metropolis of Czernagora, 309
 Chalcedon, Council of (451), 78-79; and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 27; condemns Dioscur of Alexandria, 14; Canon XXVIII, 37, 38; the legates protest against Canon XXVIII, 40; its letter to the Pope, 40
 Charles the Great and the Filioque (794), 382
 Cherubikon, 415
 Chorepiscopi, 351
 Chrism, its substance, 425; right of consecrating, 284; in Roumania, 331; essential for Christians, 258

- Chrysologus, St. Peter (†450), and the Primacy, 55
- Chrysostom, St. John (†407), and the Primacy, 53, 55, 69; and Invocation of Saints, 103; and prayer for the dead, 106; and grace, 109; his liturgy, 413-418; and the Real Presence, 102, *n.* 8; uses jurisdiction outside his Patriarchate, 35
- Church, Orthodox idea of, 365-370
- Church, plan of Orthodox, 403
- Clement of Alexandria (†1217), 11-12
- Cluny, reform of, 173
- Cœnobia, 356
- Colleges, Orthodox theological, 352-353
- Communion, rite of, 416, 421
- Compton, Henry, Bishop of London (†1677), and Orthodox Church in London, 257
- Conception of the B.V.M., feast, 107
- Confession, 422
- Confessor (Priest who hears confessions), 353
- Confirmation, 421
- Constans II, Emperor (641-668), and the Primacy, 96
- Constantine I, Emperor (323-337), builds Constantinople, 29, 124; civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 31; his golden church at Antioch, 15
- Constantine IX, Monomachos, Emperor (1042-1054), 175, *seq.*
- Constantine XII, Palaiologos, Emperor (1448-1453), 217, 229; his letter to Mohammed II, 230; death and burial, 232
- Constantine V of Constantinople, 343-344; and the Church of England, 260
- Constantinople, city, 124; sack (1204) and Latin empire, 226-228; fall (1453), 229
- Constantinople, see, 28-47; Metropolis of Thrace, 33; second see, 42, *seq.*; extent of Patriarchate before the schism, 35, 44-46; now, 283-285; Court of Patriarchate, 348-349; Latin Patriarchate, 226-227, 206
- Constantinople, Patriarch of, election, 338-340; title, arms, and rights, 340-341; civil rights as head of the "Roman nation," 239-240
- Constantinople, First Council (381), 32-35, 81-82; Canon II, 23; Canon III, 32, *seq.*; Second Council (553), 82-83; condemns Origen, 12; Third Council (680), 79-80; and Illyricum, 44; Fourth Council (869), 157-159; Canon XXI, 49-50; Photian Council (879), 163-164
- Constitutions, Apostolic, and prayer for the dead, 106; and the Liturgy, 114
- Conversion to the Orthodox Church, 366, 369
- Coptic Church, 14; liturgy and the Real Presence, 102; Copts at Florence (1439), 215
- Councils, general, and Papal rights, 73-75
- Court of the Ecumenical Patriarch, 348-349
- Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople 381-383
- Creeks in East and West, 99; Orthodox Creeds, 362
- Crete, persecution in (1670), 237-238
- Crusades, dates, 222, *n.* 1; and the Orthodox, 224; Fourth Crusade (1204), 225-228
- Crusaders' states in Syria, 223
- Cupola and Byzantine architecture, 125
- Cusa, Alexander, of Roumania, his robbery, 330
- Cyprus, Church of, 47-50, 290-293

- Cyril of Alexandria, St. (†444), and the Primacy, 58
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St. (†386), and St. Peter, 53
 Cyril II of Jerusalem and the Bulgars (1872), 288
 Cyril Basiliu of Kyreneia, 291, *seq.*
 Cyril Papadopoulos of Kition, 291, *seq.*
 Czernagora, Church of, 308-309
 Czernovitz, Church of, 323-325
- DAMASCUS, Pope, 366-384; and Canon III of Constantine I, 34
 Damianos of Jerusalem, 290
 Dandolo, Henry, Doge of Venice (†1204), 226
 Deacons in Orthodox Church, 353; vestments, 408
 Depositions of Patriarchs of Constantinople, 241-242
 Development of doctrine, 363, 393
 Dioceses, civil, of the Empire in the 4th century, 21-22
 Dionysius of Alexandria (†264) and the Primacy, 68; on schism, 100
 Dioscur of Alexandria (444-451), 13
 Divisions of the Empire under Diocletian (284-305), 21
 Dominus of Venice (c. 1054) and Peter III of Antioch, 46, *n.* 2, 189
 Dositheos of Jerusalem (1669-1707), 267; his "Confession," 268, 364
 Duligeris Panaretos, 292
- EADMER's account of the Synod of Bari (1098), 203
 "East," Roman diocese and prefecture, 22
 Eastern Churches from 5th to 9th century, 49
 Edessa, Church of, 16; school, 19-20
 Egeria's pilgrimage, 26
 Egypt, Church of, &c., *see* Alexandria
 Egyptian monks, 13
- Election of Primate of Constantinople, 339-340
 Emperors, Roman, and the Primacy, 61-62
 Enharmonic intervals in Byzantine Plainsong, 411
 Ephesus, Metropolis of Asia, 23; Metropolitan called Patriarch, 24
 Ephesus, Council of (431), 76-77; and *see* of Jerusalem, 26; and Church of Cyprus, 47; anathema against additions to the Creed, 383
 Ephrem, St. (†c. 379), and St. Peter, 53; and the B.V.M., 108
 Epiklesis, 386-388; in Roman liturgy, 386; Byzantine Epiklesis, 386, *n.* 3
 Epiphanius (†403) and the Primacy, 54
 Epirus, Orthodox Church in, 314
 Erastianism of Byzantine Church, 30
 Ethiopia, Church of, 12
 Euchelaion, 424
 Eugene IV, Pope (1431-1447), 208, *seq.*
 Eugenikos, Mark, of Ephesus, at Florence (1439), 212
 Eulogion, 120
 Eulogius of Alexandria (†608), and the Primacy, 54
 Eusebeia Society, 427
 Eusebius of Cæsarea (†c. 340) and the Primacy, 52, 54; and the Church of Alexandria, 12
 Eutychius of Constantinople (552-582) and the Primacy, 59
 Exarch, Bulgarian, 319, *seq.*; Byzantine, 349
 Excommunication, 120; of Cerularius and his party (1054), 184-185
- FAITH, appeals to Rome in questions of, 57-61
 Fasts, the four great, 399; fasting, 426
 Feasts of Orthodox Church, 400-401

- Ferrara—Florence, Council of (1438–1439), 208–216
- Filioque, Photius' accusation, 153 ; at Lyons II, 206 ; at Florence, 214 ; not in Eastern Uniates' Creed, 206–207 ; Bishop Browne and the Filioque, 260, *n.* 1 ; theology, 372–384 ; first used in Spain, 381
- Fire of Purgatory at Florence, 214, 382
- Firmilian of Cæsarea (232–269), 24
- Firmilian of Uskub, 327
- Flavian of Constantinople and the Primacy (449), 71
- Fortunatov, Russian priest, 303
- Fulgentius Ferrandus (†c. 546) and the Primacy, 58
- Funerals, Orthodox, 426
- GELASIVS I, Pope (492–496), and the Primacy, 71
- Gelzer, H., Professor (†1906), and Orthodox monks, 359–360
- Gennadios II (Scholarios) of Constantinople (1453–1456), 217, 241 ; his "Confession," 363
- Gennadios, Archimandrite of Alexandria in England (1714), 257
- Genoa, republic of, and the fall of Constantinople (1453), 230
- Georgian Church, 17, 304–305
- Gerasimos of Jerusalem (†1897), 289
- Germanos II of Constantinople (1222–1240), 205
- Germanos III of Constantinople (1267), 206
- Giustiniani, John, 230, 241
- Glabas, Isidore, of Thessalonica (†c. 1393), and the Immaculate Conception, 391
- Grace, theology of, 108
- Grafton, Bishop of Fond du Lac, and the Anglican Faith, 260, *n.* 1
- Gratian, Emperor (390), and the Primacy, 61–62
- "Great Church," the, 283
- Greater Greece, 45–46, 174, 203
- Greek Church, 312–316
- Greek language, modern, 251, *n.* 1 ; Greek language for the Liturgy in Macedonia, 276
- Greek-Ruthenian College at Rome, 246
- Gregory Nazianzene, St. (†c. 390), and the ambition of Primate of Constantinople, 34
- Gregory of Nyssa, St., and Purgatory, 106
- Gregory the Illuminator, St., 24
- Gregory I, Pope (590–604), refuses to acknowledge Canon III of Constantinople I, 34 ; and the five Patriarchates, 44 ; and Illyricum, 45
- Gregory X, Pope (1271–1276), and Lyons II, 205, *seq.*
- Gregory V of Constantinople (†1822), 341–342
- Gregory VI of Constantinople (†1871) and the Bible societies, 256
- Gregory Asbestos of Syracuse, 136
- Grottaferrata monastery, 168–170
- HAGIA SOPHIA at Constantinople, 125–129
- Hannan, the notary of Edessa, 16
- Hegumenos, title, 355
- Heraclea, Metropolis of Thrace, 23, 29
- Heraclius, Emperor (610–641), 121
- Hercegovina and Bosnia, Church of, 334–337
- Hermannstadt, Church of, 316
- Hierarchy in the local churches, 5
- Hormisdas, Pope (514–523), and the Primacy, 71 ; his formula, 83–86
- Humbert of Silva Candida, Cardinal (†1063), 168, 179, *seq.* ; his "Dialogue," 183 ; Bull of Excommunication, 184

- IBERIA, *see* Georgia
 Idiorythma, 356
 Ignatius of Antioch, St. (†107), 15; and the Hierarchy, 5
 Ignatius of Constantinople (†846) elected, 135; deposed, 138; in exile, 141; deposed by Synod of Constantinople, 144; restored, 156; and the Bulgars, 160; canonized, 160; his character, 161
 Ikonostasis, 403-404
 Ikons, 129, 404, *n.* 1
 Illyricum, question of, 44
 Images and relics, 104
 Immaculate Conception, 107, 391
 Independence of Balkan Churches, 277
 Indulgences, 390
 Innocent III, Pope (1198-1216), and the Fourth Crusade, 225-226
 Investiture of Primate of Constantinople by the Sultan, 241
 Invocation of Saints, 103
 Ionian Isles, Orthodox Church in, 314
 Ipek, Patriarchate of, 306
 Irenæus, St. (†202), and the Primacy, 6
 Isaac I (Komnenos), Emperor (1057-1059), 194
 Isaac II, Emperor (†1204), 226
 Isidore of Kiev, Cardinal, 212
 Isidore II of Constantinople (1456-1463), 244
 Islam a theocratic democracy, 236
 Ison in Byzantine Plainsong, 411
- JACOBITES, 20-21; at Florence (1439), 216
 James, St., the Less, first Bishop of Jerusalem, 25; his liturgy, 115-116, 395, *n.* 1
 Janissaries, 236
 Jeremias II of Constantinople (†1595), 248; and the Lutherans, 109, 252-253
 Jeremias III of Constantinople and the Russian Church (1721), 295
- Jerome, St. (†420), and the Primacy, 70
 Jerusalem, *See* of, 25-28; now, 288-290; title and arms of Patriarch, 350; Melkite Primate and the schism, 187
 Jerusalem, Latin kingdom (1099-1187), 221-224; Anglican Bishopric (1841-1881), 258
 Jerusalem, Synod of (1672), 267-268; and Transubstantiation, 384
 Joachim III of Constantinople, 344; his encyclical, 345-346
 John, St., the Evangelist, first Bishop of Ephesus, 23
 John, first Bishop of Georgia, 18
 John VIII, Pope (872-882), acknowledges Photius, 162
 John XXI, Pope (1276-1277), requires the Filioque in Eastern Creed, 207
 John IV. (the Faster) of Constantinople (582-595), 43
 John II, Palaiologos, Emperor (1425-1448), 210
 Joseph I of Constantinople (1268-1274), 206; restored, 208
 Joseph II of Constantinople (1416-1439), 210; his death, 213
 Joseph, Bulgarian Exarch, 320
 Julian, Emperor (361-363), at Antioch, 15
 Julian Calendar, 398
 Julius I, Pope (337-352), and the Primacy, 68
 Jurisdiction and ordination, 7, 38, 45, 47-48; jurisdiction of Primate of Constantinople outside his Patriarchate, 35, 284, 292, 310-311; limit of his jurisdiction now, 284
 Justin Martyr, St. (†166), and the Liturgy, 113
 Justin II, Emperor (685-695), and Cyprus, 48
 Justinian I, Emperor (523-565), 121; and the Primacy, 62; and Illyricum, 45


- Juvenal of Jerusalem (420-458), 27 ;
at Chalcedon, 36
- KALLAY, Baron, Governor of Hercegovina and Bosnia (†1903), 336, *n.* 1
- Karavangelis, Germanos, of Kastoria, 331, *n.* 2, 344, 352, 353, 427, 435, *n.* 1
- Kellion, 355
- Kiev, Metropolis of Russia, 294
- Khalifah's position in Islam, 233, *seq.*
- Kolyba, 426-427
- Koran, 233, *seq.*; and Kafirs and Kitabis, 234
- Kritopulos, Metrophanes (†1641), 250, 364
- Kyriakos, Professor Diomedes, and the Anglicans, 262
- LANGUAGES, different in East and West, 88; liturgical in Orthodox Church, 397
- Lateran Synod (863), 148
- Latin rights at the Holy Places, 224; Patriarchates and Sees in the East, 224
- Latin-favourers, 433-434
- Legates, Roman, at Chalcedon, 36 (*see also* each Council); and Photius, 143, *seq.*, 157, 163; and Cerularius, 183, *seq.*
- Leger, Anton, 265
- Leo I, Pope (440-461), refuses to accept Canon III of Constantinople I, 34; and Canon XXVIII of Chalcedon, 28, 41
- Leo IX, Pope (1048-1054), 173, *seq.*; and the Primacy, 174; letter to Leo of Achrida, 181; letters to Cerularius and the Emperor, 182
- Leo XIII, Pope (1878-1903), and the Orthodox Church, 434-435
- Leo III, the Isaurian, Emperor (717-741), 121; and the Primacy, 72; gives Isauria to Constantinople, 44
- Leo VI, Emperor (886-912), deposes Photius, 164; his fourth marriage, 167
- Leo of Achrida, 178
- Leopold I, Western Emperor and King of Hungary (1658-1705), 307
- Liturgical year, Orthodox, 398-401
- Liturgies, 111-119, 412; of St. Chrysostom, 413-418; Eastern Liturgies and Rome, 112
- Logothete, the Great, 349
- Logothetes, Porphyrios, of Sinai, 311
- Lucian of Antioch, 18
- Lukaris, Cyril, of Constantinople (†1638), 264-268
- Lyons, Second Council of (1274), 204-208
- MACARIUS (†390) and the Real Presence, 101
- Malaxos, Manuel (†c. 1581), 249
- Marcian, Emperor (450-457), 14, 37
- Margariti, Apostolos, 332
- Margunios, Maximos (†1602), 249
- Mark, St., first Bishop of Alexandria, 11; his liturgy, 117-118
- Marriage of Orthodox clerks, 353
- Martin I, Pope (649-655), 56; and the Primacy, 72; and Illyricum, 45
- "Marzuka," 147
- Matrimony, sacrament of, 424
- Maurus of Ravenna (666), 96
- Maximos III of Constantinople (1476-1482), 244
- Maximus, Confessor (7th century), and the Primacy, 59
- Melanchthon, Philip (†1560), and the Orthodox Church, 252
- Meletian schism at Antioch (361-415), 90-92
- Meletios of Antioch (†1906), 287-288
- Melkite Church in Egypt, 14; in Syria, 20
- Menaion of Constantinople and the Primacy, 54, 57
- Meniates, Elias (†1714), 251

- Metanoia, 119
 Methodius of Constantinople (846), 135
 Metochion, 358, *n.* 4
 Metrophanes I of Constantinople (4th century), 29
 Metrophanes II of Constantinople (1440-1443), 217
 Metropolitans in the first three centuries, 7; title, 8, *n.* 1; in modern times, 350; in Greece, 314
 Metusiosis, 385
 Michael III, the Drunkard, Emperor (842-867), 137, *seq.*; first letter to the Pope, 143; second letter, 145; third letter, 150; his manners, 147; death, 155
 Michael VIII, Palaiologos, Emperor (1259-1282), 205-206
 "Millet" = Nation, 239
 Mirian, King of Georgia, 17
 Missions, Russian, 298
 "Mixed National Council" at Constantinople, 339
 Modes in Byzantine Plainsong, 410
 Mogilas, Peter, of Kiev (†1647), 250; his "Confession," 364; and Transubstantiation, 385
 Mohammed II, the Conqueror, Sultan (1451-1481), 228-230, 217
 Monastic habit, 356
 Monks in Orthodox Church, 354-360
 Monophysites in Egypt, 13; Syria, 20; Armenia, 24
 Montenegro, *see* Czernagora
 Morosini, Thomas, first Latin Patriarch of Constantinople (1204), 226
 Moscow, Patriarchate of, 294
 Moslem conquest of Egypt, 14; Syria, 21, 27; the Balkans, 210; Constantinople, 229-232; Moslem law, 233-236
 Murad III, Sultan (1574-1595), 237
 Mysteries, Seven great, 101, 420-426
 "NATIONS" in the Turkish Empire, 239
 Nea Iustiniane, 49
 Nectarius of Constantinople (381-397), 34
 Neophytos VIII of Constantinople (1894), 342
 Nestorianism in the Antiochene Patriarchate, 19
 Nestorians at Florence, 216
 Nicæa, First Council of (325), 75-76; Canon VI and the three Patriarchates, 9; Canon VII and Jerusalem, 26
 Nicæa, Second Council of (787), 80
 Nicæa, Empire at (1204-1261), 227
 Nicholas I, Pope (858-867), 141, *seq.*; declares for Ignatius, 147; letters to Michael III and Photius, 147; encyclical to Eastern Patriarchates, 148; excommunicates Photius, 149; and the Bulgars, 151
 Nicholas III, Pope (1277-1280), excommunicates the Emperor Michael VIII, 207
 Nicholas V, Pope (1447-1453), 229
 Nikodemos of Jerusalem (1890), 289
 Nikon of Moscow (†1681), 299
 Nilos, St., at Grottaferatta (10th century), 169-170
 Nino, St., Apostle of Georgia (4th century), 17
 Nisibis, Church of, 17
 Non-jurors and Orthodox, 257
 Nubia, Church of, 12
 Number of Orthodox Christians, 283
 Nuns, Orthodox, 360
 "ŒCUMENICAL Patriarch," title, 43
 Office, divine, in Orthodox Church, 418-420
 Oikonomos (†1857), 315
 Order, Holy, 423
 Orders, Latin, doubtful, 423; Anglican, 261-262
 Ordination and jurisdiction, 7
 Origen (†254), 11; and St. Peter, 52

- Orthodox Churches, list of, 273 ;
Orthodox, only true Church, 365-370
- Osiander, Luke, and the Orthodox (1577), 253
- PALMER, William, of Magdalen, his visit to the Russian Church (1840-1841), 258-259, 303
- Palut of Edessa (2nd century), 17
- Pantænus of Alexandria († c. 212), 11
- "Paptic Church," 437
- Parastron, John, O.F.M. (13th century), 206
- Paschasius, Roman Legate at Chalcedon (451), 14
- Patara, Bishop of (4th century), and the Primacy, 56
- Patriarch, title, first use of, 8
- Patriarch of Constantinople, his election, 339 ; title and arms, 340 ; dress, 340 ; privileges, 341
- Patriarchists and Exarchists in Macedonia, 320-321
- Paul of Samosata (260-269), 18
- Pegas, Meletios (†1603), 247, 253
- Peloponnesios, Maximos of Constantinople (1476-1482), 247
- Peter, St., Prince of the Apostles, 52-54 ; First Bishop of Rome, 54 ; Anthimos VII of Constantinople doubts this, 436 ; First Bishop of Antioch, 15
- Peter the Dyer of Antioch (470-488) and Cyprus, 48
- Peter III of Antioch (1052), 188, 46, *n* 2 ; his letter to Cerularius, 191
- Peter I, Russian Czar (1689-1725), 295 ; and the English non-jurors, 257
- Phanar at Constantinople, 243
- "Pharaoh," the Christian, 13
- Pharmakides, Theoklitos (†1860), 314-315
- Philetism, 277
- Phlangenion at Venice, 240
- Phos hilaron, 420
- Photios of Alexandria, 285, 289
- Photius of Constantinople (†891), 138, *seq.* ; his writings, 139 ; intruded, 140 ; first letter to the Pope, 142 ; second letter, 146 ; excommunicated, 149 ; Encyclical to the Bulgars, 151 ; Encyclical against the Latins, 152 ; at Constantinople IV, 159 ; his followers' punishment, 158 ; exiled, 160 ; restored, 162 ; second exile, 164 ; death and apotheosis, 165 ; character, 165
- Politics in the Orthodox Church, 274-283
- Polycarp, St. (†166), and the Roman Church, 67
- Pope, his different rights, 9 ; not Patriarch in the East, 87 ; Orthodox view of his position, 370-372
- "Porte, Sublime," 238, *n*. 1
- Portrait of our Lord at Edessa, 17
- "Prædara" Encyclical (1894), 434-435
- Preaching in the Orthodox Church, 426
- Predestination, 108
- Presence, Real, 101
- Priest's vestments, 407
- Primacy, Roman, at Lyons II, 206 ; at Florence, 214
- "Primacy of honour" of Constantinople, 32
- Procession of the Holy Ghost, 374-380
- Prokopios of Durazzo, 346
- Proselytizing in the East, 254-255
- Prospora, 413
- Prothesis, 404
- Psellos, Michael (11th century), 177, 194
- Purgatory, 105, 388-391 ; at Florence, 214
- QUINISEXTUM, Council (692), 94-95

- RASKOLNIKS, 299, *seq.*
 Ravenna and Byzantine Art, 123
 Rayahs, 233-238 ; their disabilities, 235
 "Relations" in the Blessed Trinity, 376-377
 Relations between East and West after Photius, 168-170
 Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, 422
 Reunion after Photius, 166-167
 Rodoald of Porto, Legate (861), 143, *seq.*
 Roman Primacy in the first two centuries, 6 ; Roman Patriarchate, 9, 10
 Rome cut off from the Empire, 93 ; her attitude towards the Eastern Churches, 201
 Roumanian Church, 328-334
 Roumans in Macedonia, 332 -
 Russia, Church of, 293-303
 Russia and the Phanar, 278-281 ; in Syria, 279-280 ; at Athos, 359
 Russian Palestine Society, 280 ; Russian heretics, 301-302
- SACRAMENTS, 101, 420-426
 Sacramentals, Orthodox, 119
 Saints of the Byzantine Church, 103
 Sarajevo, Metropolis of Hercegovina and Bosnia, 335
 Sardica, Council of (343), 68
 Saturday, Latin fast-day, 178
 Schisms between Rome and Constantinople before Photius, 96
 Selim I, Sultan (1512-1520), 237
 Seraphim, St. (†1833), 297
 Serapion of Antioch (†209), 17
 Sergius, Monophysite Primate of Antioch (6th century), 20
 Serbia under Stephen Dushan (†1355), 306
 Serbia, Church of, 325-327 ; in Macedonia, 326
 Service books, Orthodox, 401-402
- Sinai, autocephalous monastery, 310-312
 Sketa, 355
 Society, Byzantine (527-1453), 120-121
 Sokolski, Catholic Bulgarian Archbishop (1861), 318
 Sophronius of Jerusalem (†638), 27 ; and the Primacy, 64
 Sozomen (c. 450) and the Primacy, 55, 57
 Stauropegia, 355
 Stethatos, Niketas (11th century 179, 184
 Successor of St. Peter inherits his rights, 54-57
 Symbolic books, Orthodox, 362-365
 Synod, Holy, in Russia, 295, *seq.*
- TARASIIUS of Constantinople and the Primacy, 65
 "Teaching of the XII Apostles" and the Liturgy, 112
 Theodore I, Pope (642-649), and the Primacy, 63, 71
 Theodore of Mopsuestia (†429), 18, 19
 Theodore of Studium, St. (†826), and the Primacy, 65-67
 Theodoret of Cyprus (†458) and the Primacy, 56, 58, 70
 Theodosius II, Emperor (408-450), and the See of Jerusalem, 27 ; gives Asia to Constantinople, 35
 Theodosius and Theodore of Gangres (c. 669) and the Primacy, 64
 Theological discussions in the modern Orthodox Church, 391-393
 Theology in the East, its character, 110
 Thessaly, Orthodox Church in, 314
 "Through" the Son, Procession of the Holy Ghost, 380

- Tiflis, Metropolis of Georgia, 18
 Timothy the Cat of Alexandria (5th century), 14
 Tirnovo, Metropolis of Roumania (13th and 14th centuries), 328
 Titles and arms of Orthodox Patriarchs, 340, 349-351
 Tomos of Anthimos IV of Constantinople against the Greeks (1850), 313
 Transubstantiation, 384-386
 Trebizond, Empire at (1240-1461), 227, 232, *n.* 2
 Trent, Council of, and Purgatory, 389; and Indulgences, 390
 Trinity, Mystery of the Holy, in 3rd and 4th centuries, 110
 Trullo, First Council in (680), 79-80; Second Council in Trullo (692), 94-96
 Turks invade Europe (1354), 210; take Constantinople (1453), 219-232; Turkish race, 237, *n.* 1
 URBAN II, Pope (1088-1099), and the Council of Bari, 203
 VICTOR I, Pope (189-199), and the Primacy, 67
 Vessels used in the Byzantine rite 408-409
 Vestments, Byzantine, 405-408
 Vlachs, *see* Roumans
 Vladika of Czernagora, 309
 WAKE, Archbishop of Canterbury (†1737), and the Orthodox Patriarchs, 258
 Waters blessed on the Epiphany, 426
 Worcester College, Oxford, proposed as a Greek College, 257
 ZACHARIAS of Anagni, Legate in 861, 144; excommunicated, 148
 Zanzalos, James (Baradaï), Monophy site Bishop in Syria (543), 20
 Zinzendorf, Count (†1760), and the Orthodox Church, 253



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

44539

281.96

F776

